ABSTRACT

COUNSELING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

JONES, GWENDOLYN DELORES B.S. TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY, 1983
M.ED. TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY, 1985

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADOLESCENT VIOLENT BEHAVIOR, ILLEGAL DRUG USAGE, PEER ASSOCIATION, AND FAMILY ENVIRONMENT

Advisor: Dr. Lloyd C. Williams

Dissertation dated July, 1998

This study examined adolescent violent behavior among a sample of African American juveniles in a Child Treatment Center School in Atlanta, Georgia. The ages of the participants ranged from 13 to 18. Three instruments were utilized in collecting data: the Family Environment Scale, the Carlson Psychological Survey, and the Index of Peer Relations. Information was provided pertaining to the dependent variable, adolescent violent behavior, and the independent variables of illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment.

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The predicted relationship between the variables was that there is a significant relationship between adolescent violent behavior and illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment. The variables were subjected to inferential statistics using the Pearson

product-moment correlation coefficient technique. Each of the hypotheses was subsequently tested utilizing the same statistical method.

The findings supported the first hypothesis, in that there was a relationship between adolescent violent behavior and illegal drug usage. The relationships between adolescent violent behavior and peer association and family environment were not supported by the data.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADOLESCENT VIOLENT BEHAVIOR, ILLEGAL DRUG USAGE, PEER ASSOCIATION, AND FAMILY ENVIRONMENT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

GWENDOLYN DELORES JONES

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

JULY 1998

R V T 109

© 1998

GWENDOLYN DELORES JONES

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I give all glory, honor, and praises to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, for it is through Him that all things are possible. I would like to extend my appreciation and thanks to the faculty members in the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, Dr. Lloyd Williams, Dr. Eugene Herrington, and Dr. Marion Dinkins. I extend very special thanks to Dr. Claudette Williams, Department of Educational Leadership, and to Dr. Trevor Turner, Dean, School of Education. I extend further thanks to Dr. Carrie Roseberry, Director of the Child Treatment Center School (Fulton County, Georgia) for allowing me to work through her program.

To my parents, Mr. and Mrs. R. K. Jones, I cannot thank you enough for your love, support, and encouragement as I endured many challenges while in the process of completing this project. My brother and sister, I love you, and this degree is as much yours as it is mine.

To the numerous friends, family, and colleagues who have been here since the beginning, your prayers, kindness, and support were never unappreciated.

I can do all things through Him who giveth me strength.

Phillipians 4:13 (New International Version)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Violence is a major social and health problem that affects large numbers of children and families (Fraser, 1995). Though teenagers account for approximately 10% of the population, they are victims in nearly 25% of all violent crimes (Allen-Hagen & Sickmund, 1993; Moone, 1994). According to Snyder and Sickmund (1995), although only about one in five violent crimes is committed by a youth, youths have become markedly more involved in violent acts over the past decade. Between 1984 and 1993, the number of juveniles arrested for murder rose 168%, and weapons violations rose 126% (Children's Defense Fund, 1995).

Rosenburg (1995) reported that, on the basis of self-report and victimization data, it is not clear whether youths are fighting more than in the past. It is clear, however, that the fights are resulting more often in injury and death due to utilization of firearms. The growing availability of handguns, the declining socioeconomic conditions of many families, and the emergence of street subcultures based on crack and other illicit drugs has made adolescence far deadlier (Fraser, 1995; Prothrow-Stith, 1995).

Because birth rates declined and the size of the teenage birth cohort grew smaller during the early 1980s, there were fewer children at risk-prone ages for delinquency and violence. However, birth rates are now on the rise, so this is about to change. Over the next 10 years, the number of teenagers in the population will increase by approximately 22% (Krauss, 1994; Reno, 1995). Even if the rate at which it occurs does not change, the seeds have been sown for increases in youth violence (Fraser, 1996).

A crime against an individual may lead to physical, emotional, or financial suffering. At the same time, families share the emotional pain and trauma when a relative has been victimized. In terms of communities, there is little interaction among neighbors, which is due to an overall feeling of mistrust. Society as a whole feels the strain on its law enforcement agencies and justice system.

A crime has been defined as any behavior for which society has set a penalty (National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law and the National Crime Prevention Council, 1986). In the United States, the local, state, and federal governments define those acts which are crimes. The definition of a crime can change over time. The legislative bodies that make laws defining crime consist of people who are selected to represent citizens' views. As those views change, the exact definition of a given crime may vary as well. The following are definitions of various acts of crime

as published by the National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law (NICEL) and the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) (NICEL/NCPC, 1986):

1. Homicide is intentionally causing the death of another person. Homicide is committed less frequently than other violent crimes, yet the United States has more murders per year than almost any other country. Over half of all murderers are known by their victims.

2. Rape, which is sometimes referred to as sexual battery, is the crime of forcing a person to submit to sexual intercourse. Males as well as females can be victims of sexual assault.

3. Robbery is unlawfully taking or trying to take another person's property by force or by threatening force. Robbery usually involves use of a weapon.

4. Assault is the most common violent crime. There are two types: simple and aggravated. Simple assault is the intentional threat or attempt to inflict less serious bodily injury without a weapon. Aggravated assault is the intentional threat or attempt to inflict bodily injury or death with a deadly or dangerous weapon.

Each type of the above-mentioned violent crimes occurs on a daily basis across the nation (NICEL/NCPC, 1986).

Much research has been conducted surrounding the causal factors of violence (Arnold, 1990; Baskin & Sommers, 1993; Huling, 1991; Miller, 1986; Pollack-Byrne, 1990; Weisheit &

Mahan, 1988). Baskin and Sommers (1993) investigated the problem of when and how females become involved in violent street crime. Their study explored the factors intended to provide an understanding of what leads to violent offending for a sample of female offenders. They determined that when offending begins in early years, childhood victimization (i.e., domestic violence) is viewed as the main cause; the child is physically or sexually abused. When pathways lead away from the home, drug use is said to lead females into criminal activities. These researchers determined that early experiences with violence involved fighting and weapons possession by the subjects.

In terms of family background, such factors as parental absence and parental punitive practices were investigated (Baskin & Sommers, 1993). Between-guardian abuse and guardian-respondent abuse were identified. Measures related to family criminal practices, mental health, and substance abuse were obtained. One characteristic is that the women were likely to have been raised in single-guardian, usually female-headed, households. Multiple problems were present.

Baskin and Sommers (1993) also supported findings that neighborhood characteristics, especially those with limited social and economic resources, are related to delinquency. This leads to increased risks of victimization among youths who may already be involved in violent and delinquent lifestyles. In school settings, the subjects in this study

were identified as dropouts or as being placed in detention programs. The findings also showed that drug abuse is part of a general lifestyle. The findings suggested that such factors as the effects of neighborhood, peers, and substance use contribute to criminal violence.

Social learning theory and control theories help explain how weak parental supervision, weak school attachments, association with delinquent peers, and other social and economic factors prevalent in distressed communities combine with individual-level and situational factors to initiate involvement in violent street crime. This study (Baskin & Sommers, 1993) affirms the importance of social factors in accounting for violent activities.

It appears that researchers are focusing on family and/or economic issues as possibly being contributing factors to violence. Some examples include familial changes as well as environmental influences. Some changes in the family can be attributed to the escalation of single-parent homes. Based on the statistics from the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1989), there has been a 200% increase in single-parent households since 1970, from 4 million to 8 million homes. This increase can be attributed to divorce, unwed parents, or death of a parent.

The FBI Uniform Crime Reports (1991) also found that juvenile offenders come from single-parent families.

According to their records, the estimate of juveniles coming from such homes is 70%.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (1989), working mothers are a possible contributing factor to violence. The number of mothers leaving home for work each morning rose 65%, from 10.2 million in 1990. The U.S. Bureau of the Census (1989) also reported that married couples with children comprise 26% of U.S. households, down from 40% in 1970.

There are numerous projected causal factors of violence surrounding the family. Glick and Neto (1977), Moss (1986), and Roman (1990) argued that women are driven into criminal activities by the responsibilities of single parenthood thrust upon them by the desertion of an uncaring and often abusive male partner. Specifically relating to conflict within the family, Matlack, McGreevy, Rouse, Flatter, and Marcus (1994), Simons, Whitbeck, Conger, and Conger (1991), Veneziano and Veneziano (1988), Windle (1992), and Tolan (1988) found that delinquents experience greater conflict and lower cohesion within their families as compared with nondelinquents. Since there has been such a significant increase in the aforementioned areas, there has been an increase in the development of intervention programs.

In addition to changes in the family being a possible contributing factor to violence, other issues related to external factors are also being considered. For example,

according to the American Psychological Association (1993), television violence is one of these factors. Further, the association reported that the average child has watched 8,000 televised murders and 100,000 acts of violence before finishing elementary school. Another agency, the Children's Defense Fund (1995), reported that one in six youths between the ages of 10 and 17 has seen a shooting or knows someone who has been shot. Supporting this example is the fact that the FBI Uniform Crime Reports published statistics in 1991 which showed that children under 18 are 244% more likely to be killed by guns than they were in 1986. Another possible contributing factor to violence is sexual activity. According to the National Center for Health Statistics (1989), 26% of girls age 15 reported being sexually active in 1988, as compared to only 5% in 1970.

External influences to violence impact society as a whole. As related to the influence of violence portrayed on television, families are significantly affected. Attentiveness to a television screen is common in many homes. The above-mentioned factors are a sample of ways in which society is still affected by the resulting violence. There is not necessarily more influence of one factor of violence over another, because they all have an impact on violent behavior.

A relatively recent example of an act of violence committed by a troubled adolescent involved Betty Shabazz,

widow of the slain leader Malcolm X, and her 12-year-old grandson, Malcolm III (Fitzgerald, 1997). In 1997, Malcolm III allegedly set a fire in her apartment which resulted in her death. A ruling of homicide was handed down. After the fire, the youth was held in a juvenile detention center. A family attorney reported that, if convicted, he will face 18 months in detention because of his age. It is possible, however, that his sentence can be extended until he reaches age 18. A family friend, Roscoe Brown, described Malcolm as a disturbed juvenile with psychological problems who should receive whatever treatment is necessary. Whether or not the accused receives psychological treatment when deemed necessary or whether he faces possible conviction remains a question (Fitzgerald, 1997).

Purpose of Study

The term adolescent derives from the Latin verb adolescere, which means "to grow" or "to grow from maturity" (Golinko, 1984). It has been defined as a period of growth between childhood and adulthood (deBrun, 1981). There has been general disagreement about when adolescence begins and ends, because the period tends to be prolonged in some Western cultures.

According to Matter (1984), adolescence is generally considered an intermediate stage between childhood and

adulthood. Matter further suggested that the transition from one stage to the next is gradual and uncertain, and the time span is not the same for every person, but most adolescents eventually become mature adults. Matter gave the example of adolescence being likened to a bridge between childhood and adulthood over which individuals must pass before they take their places as mature, responsible, creative adults.

Erikson (1959) described adolescence as a normal phase of increased conflict characterized by a vacillation of ego strength. The experimenting individual becomes the victim of an identity consciousness which is the basis for the youth's self-consciousness. It is during this time the individual must establish a sense of personal identity and avoid the dangers of role diffusion and identity diffusion. In order to establish identity, there must be individual efforts in evaluating personal assets and liabilities and in learning how to use these to achieve a clearer concept of who one is and who one wants to be and become.

Adolescents struggle with their identity and try to establish a sense of self. During this time period, it is important to establish and maintain contact with significant persons who serve as positive role models. External factors, such as an influential group of peers committing deviant acts, absence of a parent, or lack of supervision, may gradually persuade an individual to participate in deviant

activities. While not all adolescents who face such challenges participate in such behavior, a significant number do. In regard to ages, due to the fact that adolescence has been so widely studied, throughout this paper the term adolescent refers to individuals whose ages range from 13 to 18. In this study, all participants were of African American descent.

Adolescents who exhibit violent behavior are impacted by several outside influences. Some of these influences include but are not limited to illegal drug usage, family environment, peer association, truancy, or low self-esteem (Claus & Simardas, 1992; Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1987; Simons et al., 1991). Consequently, this dissertation was embarked upon to determine the relationship between adolescent violent behavior and the variables illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment. These variables have been identified as having an impact on adolescent violent behavior.

Statement of the Problem

One of the distressing phenomena of modern society is the increase of adolescent antisocial behavior. Adolescents have participated for decades in such activities as violent behavior including murders, rapes, and carjackings; drug usage; truancy; car theft; and property crimes. The participants of antisocial behavior are both males and

females whose ages vary (Arnold, 1990; Huling, 1991; Marcus, 1996).

A crime is an intentional act in violation of the criminal law committed without defense or excuse and penalized by the state as a felony or misdemeanor (Tappan, 1947). Criminal behavior is intentional behavior which violates a criminal code. For an individual to be held criminally responsible, he or she acknowledges knowing right from wrong and having actually committed the act.

Within the state of Georgia, as across the nation, violent crime has escalated. According to Krauss (1994) and Reno (1995), the number of teenagers in the population will increase by approximately 22%. Also according to Krauss (1994) and Reno (1995), if the rate of population increase does not change, the seeds have been sown for increases in youth violence. Snyder (1994) reported that between 1983 and 1992, juveniles were responsible for 28% of the increase in murder arrests, 27% of rapes, 27% of robberies, and 17% of aggravated assaults. The FBI (1993) reported that during the period of 1988 to 1992, juvenile violent crime arrests increased 45%; specific offenses were murder (52%), rape (17%), robbery (49%), and aggravated assault (47%).

Adolescents are increasingly charged for the commission of crimes such as homicide, rapes, and robberies. Some crimes within the state of Georgia include a 14-year-old black male shooting and killing a pregnant dry cleaners

clerk. In this incident, the perpetrator was charged with murder, armed robbery, aggravated battery, and participating in criminal gang activity. In Clayton County, Georgia, the body of a young man was found shot to death. According to authorities, this appeared to be a gang-related killing. In DeKalb County, Georgia, the body of a 15-year-old male was found near a construction site. He died from a gunshot wound to the head ("Sorry About Slaying," 1995).

The incidents occurring within the state of Georgia are similar to those across the nation. Due to media exposure and the interest in the family, adolescent violent behavior is one of the distressing phenomena of modern society. Because crime is so prevalent, fear of becoming a victim is a concern of many.

Weis and Milankovich (1975) reported that fear of crime in the United States has become a problem as serious as crime itself. Findings from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement, the Gallup Poll, and the National Victimization surveys of the Department of Justice have documented the pervasive fear of crime in this country. Based on this widespread fear, Weis and Milankovich also reported that anxiety over possible victimization takes a serious toll in the lives of Americans. Individuals may take alternate routes, carry weapons, stay off the street at night, or buy a guard dog.

Although media attention is currently focused on crime to a great degree, it is important to mention, however, that fear of crime is not a new occurrence. Clement and Kleiman (1977) reported that fear of crime is as serious as crime itself. In terms of predictors of fear, race was somewhat less important than was generally supposed.

An increase in violent crime is again questioned with regard to the booming drug industry. Adolescents have easy access to drugs, just as they do to weapons. Drug usage was not introduced as a causal factor of juvenile offenses until within the past two decades. For example, the Youth In Transition Study, conducted annually between 1969 and 1975, did not include questions pertaining to drug usage until 1972 and 1973 (Johnson, Gibson, & Linden, 1978).

Focusing on juvenile delinquency, research on drug usage shows little support that utilization of drugs causes crime in general and violence in particular. According to Kandel, Simcha-Fagan, and Davies (1986), among a representative sample of 1,004 10th and 11th graders in New York schools, drug usage was not significantly related to aggression. Findings were that past drug usage strongly predicted current drug usage, and past delinquency strongly predicted current delinquency.

Family environment, in addition to illegal drug usage, is a growing concern pertaining to the existence of adolescent violent behavior. Family environment should be of

much more concern than which parent is raising the children. The middle-class family used to be a form of social organization devoted to the nurturance of children. Parents in the neighborhood, teachers, and church members served as surrogate parents. Children had a sense of self-worth and did not retaliate when disciplined by someone outside of the family. Unfortunately, situations like the above-mentioned are a thing of the past. One reason, in particular, as reported by Adler (1994), is that over half of all marriages currently end in divorce. Adler also reported that three-quarters of married women with children 6 to 17 were in the labor force in 1992, as were nearly three-fifths of those with children under 6. As of early 1994, it was not an option for most families as to whether or not the mother worked outside of the home. As a result, children have neither a full-time mother nor high quality day care.

Adler (1994) reported that, according to Elkind (1994), what they have is called a permeable family. Elkind described this family as having children half outside of the door, with the outside world clamoring at the windows with its dangerous and seductive allure. The existence of these families appears to be more or less a living arrangement, with an agreement between partners that can be dissolved at any time. In many instances there is no parent at home on most days, so children are left to take care of themselves.

Children being left unsupervised can be an instant invitation for delinquent behavior.

The association of adolescents and their peers is another area of concern regarding violent behavior. According to Warr (1993), adolescents live their lives in two different social worlds and have two different masters. While attending school and participating in extracurricular activities, adolescents are surrounded by their peers. Interaction with peers may result in either a positive or negative experience for those individuals involved. Parents are not in the presence of their offspring 24 hours a day and, therefore, are trusting the values instilled in them to make good choices of peers. Peers are regarded as potential instigators of delinquency, and parents are regarded as potential barriers.

Research Questions

In an attempt to determine the relationship between adolescent violent behavior and illegal drug usage, peer association, and the family environment, the following research questions were posed and used to guide the study.

1. Is there a relationship between illegal drug usage and adolescent violent behavior?

2. Is there a relationship between peer association and adolescent violent behavior?

3. Is there a relationship between family environment and adolescent violent behavior?

4. Are males or females more prone to violent behavior?

Null Hypotheses

In an attempt to determine the relationship between adolescent violent behavior and illegal drug usage, peer association, and the family environment, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant relationship between illegal drug usage and adolescent violent behavior.

2. There is no significant relationship between peer association and adolescent violent behavior.

3. There is no significant relationship between family environment and adolescent violent behavior.

4. There is no greater occurrence of violent behavior among male adolescents than female adolescents.

Theoretical Framework

The Social Bonding Theory, formulated by Hirschi (1969), suggests that it is the individual's social bond to society that prevents the individual from deviating. According to Hirschi, when the social bond is weakened, delinquent behavior is the result. Social bonding consists of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. These

four factors are of significance in how adolescents relate to one another and their involvement in delinquent behavior.

According to LeBlanc (in Thornberry, 1997), an individual's bond to society manifests itself toward several institutions which constitute the different spheres of the individual's world. The institutions of family, school, and peers receive particular emphasis for the adolescent. The person relates to these institutions through attachment to persons and commitment to institutions.

The individual's attachment to persons is the most important element of the bond to conventional society. The significance of this element lies in the number of persons in society that can influence an individual's attachment. Parents or spouse, peers, and persons in positions of authority are examples of categories. Attachment to persons is part of the framework of the social norm that states what ought to be. The theory assumes that if a person is sensitive to the opinions of others, then he or she feels an obligation to abide by their norms. Attachment to conventional persons acts as a major deterrent to the commission of criminal acts. The stronger the ties of attachment, the more likely the person will consider them when and if he or she envisions committing a crime. This attachment to persons also counters the impact of criminal influences: a weak or broken attachment to persons increases the susceptibility to deviant and criminal influences. The

theory defines the process through which attachment to persons reduces the commission of crimes and criminal influences (LeBlanc, in Thornberry, 1997).

Another element of the bond is commitment to institutions such as school, religion, work, or success. Commitment refers to an attitude of, for example, acceptance of an institution and affective investment in education, religion, or work. If such commitments are strong, deviant behavior is costly. In essence, when a person faces the temptation to commit a crime, he or she must evaluate the costs of behavior relative to the investments made. The assumption underlying the idea of commitment to institutions is that the attitudinal investments of most persons seriously affects the decision to commit criminal acts (LeBlanc, in Thornberry, 1997).

The assumption of one aspect of a control theory, involvement, is that a person who is actively engaged in conventional behavior will not find adequate time to engage in deviant behavior. Given the inherent limitations of both time and energy for involvement in activities such as work, planning, keeping appointments, and so on, it is presumed that neither time nor energy remain for the contemplation or undertaking of deviant behavior. The theory has been so widely accepted that it is the driving force behind the emphasis on recreational activities in numerous programs which have been designed to reduce juvenile delinquency, as

well as previous thoughts that boys headed for trouble should be drafted into the army. As Sutherland (1956) stated:

> In the general area of juvenile delinquency it is probable that the most significant difference between juveniles who engage in delinquency and those who do not is that the latter are provided abundant opportunities of conventional type for satisfying their recreational interest, while the former lack those opportunities for facilities.

The foundation for this specific aspect of a control theory is expressed in the adage, "Idle hands are the devil's workshop." It has been posited by Matya and Sykes (in Kelly, 1980) that delinquents have the values of Veblens "leisure class": a search for kicks, disdain of work, a desire for the big score, and acceptance of aggressive toughness as proof of masculinity, while noting that to some extent all adolescents exhibit these values and behaviors as they navigate from a childhood of parental control to an adulthood defined and constrained by work and marriage.

Control theory assumes the existence of a common value system with which those who engage in deviant and nondeviant behavior believe the deviant act is wrong, but how do we account for the fact that one commits it and the other does not? (Hirschi, 1969). There are two mechanisms by which control theorists approach this problem. The concept of semantic dementia represents one method. Semantic dementia refers to the dissociation between rational faculties and emotional control. When beliefs are treated as mere words

that mean little if other forms of control are missing and since they represent no real obstacle to the commission of delinquent acts, nothing needs to be said about how they are handled by those committing such acts. Control theories which mention neither beliefs nor values are assumed to have taken this approach.

The concept of rationalization represents the second method. The individual "rationalizes his behavior so that he can at once violate the rule and maintain his belief in it" (Hirschi, in Kelly, 1980, p. 224). The assumption is that the individual is free to commit deviant acts because he does "not construct or adopt them in order to facilitate the attainment of illicit ends" (Hirschi, in Kelly, 1980, p. 224). Another assumption is that people vary in the extent to which they believe they should obey society's rules; "the less a person believes he should obey the rules, the more likely he is to violate them" (Hirschi, in Kelly, 1980, p. 224). A person is likely to commit delinquent acts when his beliefs in the moral validity of norms are weakened.

Within the Theory of Differential Association, developed by Sutherland and Cressey (1974), it was reported that most criminal behavior is learned behavior: behavior learned through contact with criminal elements and patterns which are present, acceptable, and rewarded in one's physical environment. According to Sutherland and Cressey (1974), this is why juvenile delinquency rates vary among

social groups, as, for example, in neighborhoods where the socialization of the young is dominated by values that stress conformity to middle class standards and respect for law enforcement agencies. In contrast, in a high delinquency area, delinquent behavior may be the norm for that culture.

Sutherland and Cressey (1974) summarized their theory with a set of nine propositions:

Proposition 1. Criminal behavior is learned, not inherited. Individuals do not commit crime because of inborn predispositions; instead, they utilize previously acquired experiences in the commission of crime and delinquency.

Proposition 2. Criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication. This communication can be either verbal (direct) or indirect.

Proposition 3. The principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups. This statement allows for the influence of impersonal mass media influences on behavior, but it clearly stresses the overwhelming importance of personal relationships on norms and action.

Proposition 4. When criminal behavior is learned, the learning includes: (a) techniques of committing the crime, which are sometimes very complicated and sometimes very simple; and (b) the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes. The learning of behavior,

then, involves not only how the behavior is to be committed but also why it is to be done.

Proposition 5. The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favorable or unfavorable. "Definitions" in this statement refer to attitudes toward the law. Since the reaction to social rules and laws is not uniform across society, youths constantly come in contact with people who maintain different views on the utility of obeying the legal code. As a result of definitions of right and wrong being varied, people experience what Sutherland (1947) called "culture conflict."

Proposition 6. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law. According to Sutherland's theory (1939, 1947), individuals will become delinquent when they are in contact with persons, groups, or events that produce an excess of definitions toward delinquency and, concomitantly, when they are isolated from counteracting forces.

Proposition 7. Differential associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity. These terms exhibit an effort to qualify the effect of definitions concerning the law on behavior. Frequency and duration have the same meanings they do in common usage. Priority indicates that associations (whether delinquent or

nondelinquent) formed in early childhood may take precedence in influence over later associations. Intensity refers to the prestige of an association or actually to the power of influence one person or group may have over another.

Proposition 8. The process of criminal behavior by association with criminal and anticriminal patterns involves all the mechanisms involved in any other learning. The learning of criminal behavior patterns is similar to the learning of nearly all other patterns and is not a matter of imitation.

Proposition 9. While criminal behavior is an explanation of general needs and values, it is not explained by those needs and values, since noncriminal behavior is an explanation of the same needs and values. Sutherland (1947) suggested that the motives for delinquent behavior cannot logically be the same as those for conventional behavior.

Joseph (1995) conducted a comparative study of the involvement of African American males and females in delinquency and examined the explanatory value of variables drawn from three traditional theories of delinquency, social control, structural strain, and differential association, for understanding delinquency among African Americans.

Structural strain theory (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960; Cohen, 1955; Merton, 1938) suggests that delinquent behavior is the result of frustration experienced by individuals who are unable to achieve legitimate social and economic success.

Social control theorists (Hirschi, 1969; Reckless, 1961) argue that the impulses to be delinquent or criminal are present in everyone, and conformity is the result of social controls placed on individuals by society. Differential association theory suggests that crime results from learning the norms and behavior associated with delinquent activity (Sutherland, 1939).

Data were collected on the variables of socioeconomic status, attachment to parents, perception of blocked or limited opportunities, commitment to school, delinquent companions, and delinquent behavior (Joseph, 1995). In the sample, 57% were males and 43% were females. The data indicated that 57% of the juveniles were delinquent; of these, 64% were males and 36% were females. Findings indicated only two variables, attachment to school and delinquent companions, were successful in explaining the delinquent behavior of African Americans in this study. The bonding perspective of social control theory and the differential association theory seem to be the best explanation of dealing with behavior among African American adolescents in this study (Joseph, 1995).

It is only the learning of deviant norms through contact with an excess of definitions toward criminality that produces delinquent behavior.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are operationally defined for use in this study and were used throughout this dissertation:

Antisocial behavior: Behavior perceived to be opposite of what is considered as the norm. Antisocial behavior encompasses criminal and noncriminal activities, some of which are punishable by law.

Adolescent: Males or females between the ages of 13 and 18. Adolescents develop a sense of identity based on the amount of confidence acquired and a feeling of sadness and continuity of experiences. If the individual cannot integrate various roles into a clear identity, role confusion may develop (Ornstein, 1992).

Juvenile delinquent: An individual between the ages of 13 and 18 who has been arrested for committing a crime or is within the justice system.

Adolescent violent behavior: Intentional use of physical force by an individual 13 through 18 years of age, in order to cause harm or injure another individual.

Summary

Information pertaining to adolescent males and females as they relate to violent behavior was discussed. The relationship between adolescent violent behavior and the variables of illegal drug usage, peer associations, and family environment were studied. Consequently, the

researcher sought to determine whether or not there is a relationship between adolescent violent behavior and the above-mentioned variables.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The main purpose of this chapter is to present relevant literature on the relationship between adolescent violent behavior and the variables of peer association, family environment, and illegal drug usage. A number of studies pertaining to adolescent violent behavior are identified and examined.

The number of violent acts committed by adolescents in America is currently at an all-time high. A complex question that is unanswered is: "Why are our children killing each other, their parents, or other adolescents?" Neither race, gender, nor age are determining factors as to who the next human casualty will be. Victims range from gang members to adolescents in classrooms to innocent bystanders. Perpetrators tend to be adolescents across various racial backgrounds and social classes.

Although humans have committed violent acts against others for decades, the forms or methods of violence have drastically changed over the years. For example, mugging an individual and subsequently injuring him or her is one form of violence. However, during the 1990s, drive-by shootings,

robberies, carjackings, and random acts of violence appear to be the norm.

Factors Contributing to Violent Behavior

As reported in Newsweek (Adler, 1994), it appears that some researchers, are focusing on various factors contributing to violence, such as changes in the family and outside influences. In the changing family structure, there has been a 200% increase in single-parent households since 1970, from 4 million to 8 million homes (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991). Related to this, an estimated 70% of juvenile offenders come from single-parent families (FBI, 1991). Another change in family structure is that the number of working mothers rose 65%, from 10.2 million in 1990 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1991). Additionally, married couples with children comprise 26% of U.S. households, down from 40% in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1989).

Outside influences are other factors to be considered. The average child has watched 8,000 televised murders and 100,000 acts of violence before completing elementary school (American Psychological Association, 1991). One in six youths between the ages of 10 and 17 has seen or knows someone who has been shot. In addition, children under 18 are 244% more likely to be killed by guns than they were in 1986 (FBI, 1991).

Changes in the family structure and outside influences affect the manner in which children are growing up. Statistics show the negative impact of these factors as contributing to violence.

Violence in Schools

The increase in violence is not limited to the streets. Crime has moved into the schools, as well. Students are assaulted at alarming rates; other forms of violence are also increasing. According to Hayes (1993), students see violence as a quick and easy solution to most of their problems. They sometimes see violence as an instantaneous response, but they do not have a full understanding of the devastating consequences.

Hayes (1993) described several instances of violent incidents which have occurred in schools. At a high school in Princeton, West Virginia, a high school student fired at the principal and held 19 classmates and a teacher hostage. This student was eventually restrained by another student. At Brentwood High School in New York City, a former student was wounded by gunfire during a basketball game. At Thomas Jefferson High School in New York City, two students were killed by gunfire in a school hallway; a 15-year-old student was charged with second-degree murder. On the same day, in a second incident at Jefferson High School, another student

committed suicide. These incidents indicate the kinds of violent activities that occur in schools on a regular basis.

Because of increased violence and crime, television specials have been developed which focus not only on violence in schools but also on the occurrences of crime in general and on attempts by communities to cope with the issues. "Kids in the Crossfire: Violence in America" (Jennings, 1993), an ABC News videotape, was filmed at Elliott Junior High School in Washington, D.C., in 1993. The youth on this special were 6 through 19 years of age and were of various racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. One common factor was that all were affected by violence. Some had actually committed violent acts, some were victims, and others were fearful of becoming victims.

One of the many issues discussed in this special television program involved the reasons why youth carry weapons. Reasons included yielding to peer pressure, killing someone on a dare, or carrying a gun for a sense of power. Some youth gave the impression that they live one day at a time and that they expect to be a victim of violent crime (Jennings, 1993).

In terms of reality, the group realized that violence is definitely a problem. In discussing solutions, several agreed that much of the responsibility should rest with the parents. Other solutions discussed for dealing with school violence included the use of conflict managers and/or

security personnel and the use of metal detectors or other screening methods. This program did not present a detailed discussion of what happens to youth once they have been arrested, nor was there any discussion indicating that they are an active part of the juvenile justice system.

The Juvenile System in the State of Georgia

In the state of Georgia, the typical teenager committed to one of the state's four youth detention centers is a Black male aged 15 to 17 who has not completed middle school ("Numbers Speak Loudest," 1994). The family has a mean monthly income of $829, and there is no father figure in the home. These teenagers have been convicted of a violent crime, burglary, or theft.

According to Tappan (1947), criminal behavior is intentional behavior which violates a criminal code. The legislative bodies that make laws defining crime consist of people who are selected to represent citizens' views. As those views change, the exact definition of a given crime may change, as well.

After the Juvenile Justice Act was approved by the Georgia Legislature in 1994, approximately 300 juveniles in Georgia were to be tried as adults. The law treats adolescents aged 13 to 17 as adults if they are accused of any of the following crimes: murder, voluntary manslaughter, rape, aggravated child molestation, aggravated

sexual battery, or armed robbery if committed with a firearm (Silk & McDonald, 1994).

Prior to the passing of this law, juveniles 13 and older were tried as adults if they were accused of capital crimes (i.e., those offenses punishable by execution or by life in prison). If juveniles were accused of such crimes, they could be tried as adults in Superior Court. If convicted, they served their sentences in youth prisons until they became adults at age 17, at which time they were transferred to the Department of Corrections and to an adult prison (Silk & McDonald, 1994).

After enactment of the 1994 law, juvenile authorities realized that the prior system was not adequately equipped to handle young criminals. They also acknowledged that the worst offenders might be beyond redemption. The bill was aimed at getting violent juveniles off the street and keeping them off for more than 1 or 2 years.

The Atlanta Journal-The Atlanta Constitution reported the case of Dye, who at the age of 13 was sentenced to life in prison for the murder of a 10-year-old female and who spent about two-thirds of his life in adult prisons. According to Dye, he never had a clear understanding of what happened in the courtroom. According to records, he signed a document agreeing to waive formal arraignment and plead guilty to murder. The outcome of this case was unusual at the time it occurred in the 1970s, given the age of the

perpetrator. Dye wondered why he bore the brunt of the approach 20 years ago if the legislature only started treating 13-year-olds as adults in 1994 ("Break the Cycle of Despair," 1994).

While it was rare that children were sentenced to adult prisons during the 1970s, it is not a rare occurrence in the 1990s. Today, questions raised by concerned individuals include the following: What should happen to children who intentionally kill someone? Who or what is the determining factor as to who is sentenced either to life in prison or to death? Is it possible for an individual to be rehabilitated while in prison? In a personal interview (1996), Greg McKeithan, Assistant District Attorney for Fulton County, Georgia, responded to the questions. After conviction, the judge determines the length of a sentence. In terms of the death penalty, members of the jury vote on it, and there is also input from the District Attorney. Based on the widespread fear that is prevalent in society and the number of individuals who are repeat offenders, perhaps rehabilitation while in prison is not realistic.

Variables Related to Adolescent Violence

Even though current research explains the causality of adolescent violence, there are additional issues which also have an impact. The remainder of this chapter explores specific variables as they relate to this topic. The

variables are peer association, family environment, and illegal drug usage. This chapter also summarizes research previously conducted as it relates to youth violence.

Peer Association

According to Warr (1993), adolescents live in two different social worlds and have two different masters. Adolescents shift regularly from the culture of their peers to the environment of family and home. The shifts from one environment to another are likely either to complement or to clash with one another. While attending school and certain extracurricular activities, they are surrounded by peers. Simultaneously, adolescents observe or participate in the various activities within the culture of their peers. These cultures have their own rules of dress, music, language, behavior, and athletic success (Coleman, 1961; Conger & Peterson, 1984). Adapting to these differences is critical for Black children.

As supported by the differential association theory (Sutherland, 1947) and by the control theory (Hirschi, 1969), peers are regarded as potential instigators of delinquency and parents are regarded as potential barriers. This information appears to be justified on empirical as well as theoretical grounds. Parents exhibit almost universal disapproval of delinquent behavior. Parents who themselves break the law do not encourage their children to

exhibit similar behavior (Hirschi, 1969; Jensen, 1972; Jensen & Brownfield, 1983; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985). In contrast, peer culture provides numerous delinquent models to adolescents; it also provides a more tolerant environment for delinquency (Hagan, 1991; Warr, 1993).

If, in fact, parents and peers are viewed as potential adversaries in the lives of adolescents, a question naturally emerges: Is parental influence capable of counteracting peer influence? Another concern is whether or not the motivation toward delinquency generated by one social environment (peer culture) can be neutralized by another (the family) (Warr, 1993).

Parental influence may counteract the influence of peers in the everyday lives of adolescents in three primary ways. Sutherland (1947) and Hirschi (1969) focused first on time spent between parents and their adolescent children. Parents who spend quality time with their children may reduce the likelihood of delinquent behavior, either by reducing opportunities for delinquency or by maximizing their effect as positive role models. Because adolescents spend so much of their time away from their parents (while in school), the ability of parents to have independent effects on self-reported delinquency may be limited. In contrast, Poole and Regoli (1979) detected significant interaction effects between the two variables. Yet, Hirschi (1969) considered both sides of the issue. He stated that

"both delinquency of companions and stakes in conformity are independently related to the commission of delinquent acts" (Hirschi, 1969, p. 210). Subsequently, he described the relation as an "interaction" where the "greater the stake in conformity, the less the impact of delinquent friends" (p. 211). Unfortunately, like most investigators, Hirschi employed no formal test or model of interaction in reaching his conclusion. Although many investigators have reported an association between parental attachment and self-reported delinquency (Gove & Crutchfield, 1982; Jensen & Rojek, 1980), it remains unclear whether parental attachment has a direct effect on delinquency or whether its effect is partially or entirely mediated by delinquent friends.

Family Environment

According to Clark (1983), few authors have investigated aspects of family interaction that may contribute to children's functioning. However, Moos (1975) has investigated a dimension of family climate called quality of family support (QFS), which taps aspects of family interpersonal relationships as perceived by family members. Moos theorized that children's functioning varies with family members' perceptions of QFS.

QFS consists of three dimensions: (a) Cohesion, the degree of help and commitment that family members provide one another; (b) Expressiveness, the degree to which family

members act openly and directly, express positive or negative feelings; and (c) Conflict, the amount of overt anger and aggression among family members. Family Cohesion has been found to be positively associated with children's levels of verbal communication skills (Garfinkle, 1982). Both Conflict and Expressiveness have been linked with psychological and social measures of health (Bell & Bell, 1982). Slater and Haber (1984) found family conflict to be negatively associated with adolescents' self-esteem and feelings of control, and positively associated with their levels of anxiety. Their study examined differences in caregivers' perceptions of Black second graders and eighth graders' adaptive functioning and maladaptive behavior associated with overall quality of family support and its components.

Participants for this study were the primary caregivers of 187 Black children, including 54 second graders and 53 eighth graders. Of the participants, 42% (n = 45) were females and 58% (n = 62) were males. The assessment instruments were verbally administered to each child's primary caregiver.

The data in this study on the quality of family support and children's adaptive functioning and maladaptive behavior reflect perceptions of the children's primary caregivers. As a result, the findings must be viewed as suggestive, pending confirmation by similar research using more objective data.

The father figure's presence or absence in the child's house (including biological fathers) was also investigated as a variable in Black children's adaptive functioning and maladaptive behavior. According to Phares (1992), in comparing mothers with fathers, fathers were found to be dramatically underrepresented in clinical child and adolescent research, and further research to investigate the effects of this variable was recommended.

Black children grow up in many different environments and therefore have had numerous experiences. What is considered as adaptive functioning in one environment is maladaptive behavior in another. The family has a significant role in the development of children. The result may be either negative or positive.

According to Bischof, Stitch, and Wilson (1992), it is unclear as to how the family environments of adolescent offenders differ, if at all, from those of juvenile delinquents who have committed either violent or nonviolent offenses.

Moos and Moos (1981) identified areas of the family environment as indicators of family functioning: relationship, personal growth, and system maintenance. Relationship assesses the degree and support family members provide one another. Personal growth assesses the extent to which family members are able to make their own decisions, and system maintenance assesses the degree of importance of

clear organization and structure in planning family activities and setting family rules.

The Family Environment Scale (FES) has been used to assess distressed families with adolescents (Moos & Moos, 1981). In comparing delinquent and nondelinquent adolescents, LeFlore (1988) found that delinquents (n = 68) perceived their families as having less active-recreational orientation, less cohesiveness, and less expressiveness than a matched group of nondelinquents (n = 130). The average age of the delinquents was 15.4 years. They were considered serious and repeat offenders and came from families of a lower to lower-middle socioeconomic level.

In another study utilizing the FES, Kleinman, Handal, Enos, Searight, and Ross (1989) found the following family factors related to distress in males: low levels of cohesion, active-recreational orientation, and expressiveness and high levels of conflict. Similarly, Friedrich, Reims, and Jacobs (1982) studied depression and suicidal ideation in adolescents and found that depression is associated with a family environment that is less cohesive, less active-recreational oriented, and more conflicted. In addition, severity of suicidal ideation was related to less cohesiveness, independence, and organization and more achievement orientation.

In summary, the family environment is a significant context for adolescents. Nine studies which directly

assessed distressed adolescents' perceptions of their family environments revealed several consistent differences between distressed and nondistressed families of adolescents. The studies were conducted by Fox, Rotatori, Macklin, Green, and Fox (1983), Friedrich et al. (1982), Kirst-Ashman (1983), Kleinman et al. (1989), LeFlore (1988), Long and Jackson (1991), Moos and Moos (1986), Stern et al. (1989), and Wood, Chapin, and Hannah (1988).

Illegal Drug Usage

There is a growing concern about the use of drugs based on their contribution to violence in communities. The increase in drug use and the expansion of the illicit drug business are explanations for the increase in violent crimes among juveniles. According to McBride (1981), research indicated that criminally involved drug users committed property offenses as a means of supporting their habits. Those studies focused mainly on heroin users, and the findings were that heroin had a depressant effect on the user as opposed to a stimulating effect. However, also according to McBride (1981), due to the rise in cocaine use among offenders and the expanding drug markets in which turf is protected through violence, future research would most likely substantiate a relationship between drug use and criminal violence.

Kandel et al. (1986) found that, among a representative sample of 1,004 10th and 11th graders in New York public schools, drug usage was not significantly related to aggression. Findings were that past drug use most strongly predicted current drug use, and past delinquency most strongly predicted current delinquency. Other research also substantiated that drug use and criminal activity are related, but not particularly causally (Elliott, Huizinga, & Ageton, 1985; Fagan, Wies, & Cheng, 1990; Johnson et al., 1978; Kandel, 1978).

Research on the effects of drug use and violence has focused mainly on alcohol and cocaine. The association between alcohol and violence has been observed for decades. Several studies ranging from domestic violence to criminal violence have substantiated this association (Murdoch, Phil, & Ross, 1990; Wolfgang & Ferracute, 1967), in addition to specific populations as offenders or Black men (Benjamin & Benjamin, 1981; Gary, 1986; Murdoch et al., 1990). However, much of the research on the association between alcohol and violence has been limited as a result of the lack of a theoretical framework in which to study the phenomenon (Collins, 1988). Collins suggested four frameworks in which to examine this relationship. The pathological framework contends that violence is the result of alcohol consumption by those with pathological disorders.

The second framework discussed by Collins (1988) is the cultural framework, in which violence that results from alcohol use is considered the outcome of cultural norms and rules. Depending on the cultural context, it is expected that similar drinking patterns have differing effects on behavior. On the other hand, Gary (1986) stated that within cultures or subcultures where violence and alcohol use are prevalent, neither one is condoned or considered a cultural norm. Alcohol and violence, according to Gary, are a result of stress-inducing circumstances, such as unemployment or possibly poor and/or inadequate housing and discrimination. Therefore, Gary contended that to consider higher rates of alcohol consumption and higher rates of homicide among Black males as cultural norms is erroneous and inaccurate.

The deviance framework was suggested by Collins (1988) to study the effects of alcohol consumption on violence. In this framework, the violence associated with alcohol use is explained in terms of the alcohol itself. Violent behavior is blamed on the alcohol, as opposed to the drinker being held accountable.

The situational framework is the final framework suggested by Collins (1988) for studying the relationship between alcohol use and violence. Within this framework, different situations explain violence which occurs as a result of alcohol use. In other words, drinking patterns and behavior vary according to the situation. According to Pagan

(1990), the association between alcohol and violence continues to be debated. Alcohol consumption remains an important correlate of violence.

According to McBride (1981) and Collins (1988), research substantiates the premise that drug usage is a contributing factor to violence. Studies by Kandel et al. (1986) and Johnson et al. (1978) also substantiated that drug use and criminal activity are related.

Summary

Violence among adolescents is not a new phenomenon. The criminal activity is no longer limited to such crimes as petty theft or arson. Rapes, robberies, carjackings, and murders are frequent occurrences in communities. These crimes are committed by males as well as females. The juveniles committing violent crimes are sometimes as young as 8 years old.

Much research has been conducted pertaining to causal factors of youth violence. Parental influence, drug use, and dropouts are only a few areas that have been researched. In conjunction with research are various theories also associated with delinquent behavior. Control theories assume that criminal behavior is inhibited by various constraints or controls. According to Hirschi (1969), the weakening of these constraints makes criminal conduct more likely. If the

bonds of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief are weak, then the result will be criminal behavior.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methodology used in this research project. Included is information pertaining to the research design, subjects, setting, variables, procedures, and limitations.

Research Design

This study was designed to use correlation theory, a statistical approach which measures the linear association of two sets of data. Under investigation was the relationship between each of the three selected variables and adolescent violent behavior. The intent was to determine whether and to what extent each of the independent variables of illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment influenced the dependent variable, adolescent violent behavior. Data were collected by three instruments.

Presentation of Variables

This study determines the relationship between the dependent variable, adolescent violent behavior, and three independent variables. A dependent variable is a response variable or output. It is that factor that is observed and

measured to determine the effect of the independent variable (Tuckman, 1994). An independent variable is the factor that is measured, manipulated, or selected by the experimenter to determine its relationship to an observed phenomenon. It is the presumed cause of any change in the outcome (Tuckman, 1994).

Definition of Variables

The following are the definitions of the dependent and independent variables.

Dependent Variable

Adolescent violent behavior was the dependent variable. In this study, adolescent violent behavior refers to acts of crime that cause intentional physical harm or death and which are committed by individuals aged 13 to 18.

Independent Variables

There were three independent variables in this study. They were illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment.

Illegal drug usage. In this study, illegal drug usage refers to the utilization of chemical substances, such as alcohol, marijuana, LSD, speed, or heroin, which are in violation of the law.

Peer association. In this study, peer association refers to a group of individuals who share similar ages, interests, and beliefs. In their peer groups, individuals need to feel that they are acceptable to and accepted by their associates. They may belong to groups formed in the neighborhood, in the classroom, or on the school grounds.

Family environment. In this study, family environment refers to the type of surrounding in which an individual lives. Family environment involves relationships among family members, marital status of parents, presence of authority figure(s), number of siblings, and interactions among individuals living in the home. Such factors influence growth and development.

Relationship Among the Variables

The predicted relationship between the dependent and the independent variables was that there is a significant relationship between the dependent variable, adolescent violent behavior, and the independent variables of illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment.

Description of Instruments

The instruments utilized in this study included the Family Environment Scale, the Carlson Psychological Survey, and the Index of Peer Relations. The Family Environment Scale was designed to assess dimensions of family

functioning, the Carlson Psychological Survey to assess and classify criminal offenders and others who have come to the attention of the criminal justice system, and the Index of Peer Relations to measure the extent, severity, or magnitude of a problem the respondent has with peers. A brief description of the instruments follows.

The Family Environment Scale

The Family Environment Scale (FES), a 90-item test, is composed of 10 subscales that measure the actual, preferred, and expected social environment of families. These 10 FES subscales assess three underlying sets of dimensions: relationship dimensions, personal growth (or goal orientation) dimensions, and system maintenance dimensions. The relationship and system maintenance dimensions primarily reflect internal family functioning, whereas the personal growth dimensions primarily reflect the linkages between the family and the larger social context (Moos, 1994).

The first dimension is relationships. The relationship dimension is global and attempts to reflect several areas such as belonging and pride, open expression, and conflict. The second dimension is personal growth and development. Autonomy, academics, competitions, family activities, and religious emphasis are central to this dimension. The final dimension is system maintenance, which focuses on the structure and organization of the family (Moos, 1994). The

system maintenance dimension also examines the amount of perceived control exercised over each member.

Table 1 presents descriptions of each subscale in each dimension. The FES is a self-report device which can be administered independently to individual family members. The FES has fair to good reliability.

The FES can be used to describe family social environments, contrast parents' and children's perceptions, and compare actual and preferred family climates. The scale can also be used to formulate clinical case descriptions, facilitate family counseling and psychotherapy, and teach clinicians and program evaluators about family systems. In addition, the scale can also be used to plan and monitor family change, evaluate the impact of counseling and other intervention programs, and help a family function more effectively (Moos, 1994).

Although many applications of the FES focus on aggregate scores and on the family as a whole, the FES can also help clinicians and others whose primary interest is the individual, not the family as a whole. An individual profile reveals how a person views the family and his or her place in it. Unlike most assessment procedures, an individual FES profile reveals a person's perceptions. Thus, as a source of unique information about the individual, the FES can enhance client assessment (Moos, 1994).

Table 1

FES Subscales and Descriptions

Subscale	Description
Relationship Dimensions:	
Cohesion	the degree of commitment, help, and support family members provide for one another
Expressiveness	the extent to which family members are encouraged to express their feelings directly
Conflict	the amount of openly expressed anger and conflict among family members
Personal Growth Dimensions:	
Independence	the extent to which family members are assertive, are self-sufficient, and make their own decisions
Achievement Orientation	how much activities (such as school and work) are cast into an achievement-oriented or competitive framework
Intellectual-Cultural Orientation	the level of interest in political, intellectual, and cultural activities
Active-Recreational Orientation	the amount of participation in social and recreational activities
Moral-Religious Emphasis	the emphasis on ethical and religious issues and values

(table continues)

Table 1 (Continued)

Subscale	Description
System Maintenance Dimensions:	
Organization	the degree of importance of clear organization and structure in planning family activities and responsibilities
Control	how much set rules and procedures are used to run family life

Source: FES Manual (Moos & Moos, 1986), p. 1.

In regard to validity of this instrument, a study was conducted to determine the factor structure of the FES items. The population sampled comprised all freshmen and sophomores at the high schools in Napolean and Findlay, Ohio. Usable data were obtained for a total of 686 subjects. All subjects completed the FES, Form R, which consists of 90 true/false items about the subject's own family.

The data were randomly split into Subsample 1 (n = 344) and Subsample 2 (n = 342) so that the factor analysis results could be replicated. The results indicated that as the original 10 subscales of the FES do not emerge as dimensions in a factor analysis they must be questioned on psychometric grounds. In addition, both the independence of the subscales and the item content of single scales were not replicated in the factor analysis (Robertson & Hyde, 1982).

Forms of the FES

The FES has three forms: The Real Form (Form R) measures people's perceptions of their current family environment. The Ideal Form (Form I) measures people's preferences about an ideal family environment. The Expectations Form (Form E) measures people's expectations about family settings.

Form I and Form E are parallel to Form R; that is, each of the 90 items in Form I and Form E corresponds to an item in Form R. The scoring keys and answer sheets for the three forms are identical.

The Ideal Form. Form I allows people to describe the type of family they prefer. This form was developed to measure family members' preferences about how a family should function. Some clinicians and consultants use Form I to assess family members' value orientations and how they change over time, such as before and after family counseling. Others use both Form I and Form R to identify areas in which people want to change their family.

The Expectations Form. Form E helps people to describe their expectations of what a family will be like. In premarital counseling, Form E clarifies prospective partners' expectations of their family. Form E can identify foster children's expectations of a new family and help members of blended families to focus on how they expect their new family to function. Form E can also identify

parents' expectations about their family after a major life transition such as retirement or the youngest child leaving home.

The Real Form. Form R of the FES helps people to describe their current family as they perceive it. Clinicians, consultants, and program evaluators use this form to: (a) understand individuals' perceptions of their conjugal and nuclear families, for example, as part of family counseling or educational programs; (b) formulate clinical case descriptions and understand the impact of the family on adaptation; (c) monitor change and promote improvement in families; (d) describe and compare family climates and contrast partners' perceptions or parents' and children's perceptions; (e) predict and measure the outcome of treatment; (f) focus on how families adapt to life transitions and crises; and (g) understand the impact of the family on children and adolescents.

For the purposes of this study, Form R was administered to the population.

FES Subscales and Descriptions

Form R of the Family Environment Scale consists of three dimensions and 10 subscales. The Relationship Dimension is comprised of the subscales of Cohesion, Expressiveness, and Conflict. Cohesion refers to the degree of commitment, help, and support family members provide for

one another. Expressiveness is the extent to which family members are encouraged to express their feelings directly. Conflict is the amount of openly expressed anger and conflict among family members.

The Personal Growth Dimension is comprised of the following subscales: Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation, and Moral-Religious Emphasis. Independence refers to the extent to which family members are assertive, self-sufficient, and make their own decisions. Achievement Orientation relates to how much activities (such as school and work) are cast into an achievement-oriented or competitive framework. Intellectual-Cultural Orientation refers to the level of interest in political, intellectual, and cultural activities. Active-Recreational Orientation is the amount of participation in social and recreational activities. Moral-Religious Emphasis refers to the emphasis on ethical and religious issues and values.

The System Maintenance Dimension is comprised of the subscales Organization and Control. Organization is the degree of importance of clear organization and structure in planning family activities and responsibilities. Control relates to how much set rules and procedures are used to run family life.

Scoring

A template is provided for scoring that makes the process simple. Items on the FES are arranged so that each column of responses on the answer sheet constitutes one subscale. In determining a person's raw score (R/S), the number of S's showing through the template in each column is counted, and the total is then entered in the R/S box at the bottom of the answer sheet. In converting an individual's subscale R/S or a family's mean R/S to a standard score (S/S), a table is included in the User's Guide.

The Carlson Psychological Survey (CPS)

The Carlson Psychological Survey (CPS) was designed to assess and classify criminal offenders and others who have come to the attention of the criminal justice or social welfare system. The CPS is a 50-item questionnaire suitable for adolescents and adults, specifically developed on offender populations to overcome the difficulties encountered in using existing standardized tests with this population. Administration time is generally 15 minutes. The five-category response format includes space for additional respondent comments, eliminating the frustration commonly noted with true-false formats. The scale scores provided by the CPS represent four content areas and one validity check: antisocial tendencies, chemical abuse, self-depreciation,

thought disturbance, and validity. Test-retest stability ranges from .87 to .92 (Carlson, 1982).

Table 2 presents descriptions of the content areas of the CPS.

Table 2

CPS: Content Areas and Descriptions

Content Areas	Descriptions
Chemical Abuse (CA)	The degree to which the person abuses drugs or alcohol
	The relevance of the chemicals to his antisocial behavior
Thought Disturbance (TD)	Disorganization of thinking, confusion, perceptual distortions and hallucinations, and feelings of unreality
Antisocial Tendencies (AT)	A hostile animosity and socially defiant attitude in the person
	A person's willingness to be assaultive or threatening
Self-Depreciation (SD)	The degree to which the person degrades himself and his actions
Validity (V)	The person maintains an acceptable test-taking attitude

Source: CPS Manual (Carlson, 1982), pp. 1-2.

The Index of Peer Relations

The Index of Peer Relations (IPR) is a 25-item scale designed to measure the extent, severity, or magnitude of a problem the respondent has with peers. See Table 3 for a description of the variables included in the IPR. The IPR can be used as a global measure of relationship problems with peers or one or more specific peer reference groups can be considered. A note stating which reference group is being used should be placed at the top of the questionnaire. The IPR has a cutting score of 30, with scores above 30 indicating the respondent has a clinically significant problem and scores below 30 indicating the individual has no such problem. Another advantage of the IPR is that it is one of nine scales of the Clinical Measurement Package (Hudson, 1982), all of which are administered and scored in the same manner.

The IPR has a mean alpha of .94, indicating excellent internal consistency, and an excellent (low) Standard Error of Measurement of 4.44. Test-retest data are not available.

The IPR has excellent known-groups validity, significantly distinguishing between clients judged by themselves and their therapists as either having or not having peer relationship problems (Hudson, 1982).

Table 3

Descriptions of Variables Included in the IPR

Description of Variables	Variables
Self-awareness of peer relationships	SA PEER
Subject feels peers do not care about him/her	SFPEEDC
Subject feels mistreated by peers	SFMISTR
Subject enjoys respect of peers	S RPEERS
Subject feels as if he/she does not belong	S NOTBEL
Subject feels peers are snobs	S PEESNO
Subject feels understood by peers	S UNDERS
Subject feels liked very much	S LIKED
Subject hates current peer group	S HATEPE
Subject feels left out of peer groups	S LEFTOU
Subject feels peers enjoy subject's company	S ENJCOM
Subject likes current peer groups	S LIKPEE
Subject feels disliked by peers	S DIS PEE
Subject desires a different peer group	S DIFFPE
Peers are nice to subject	PEE NICE
Peers look up to subject	P LOOKUP
Subject thinks he/she is important	S THNIMP
Subject enjoys respect of peers	S RPEERS
Subject feels unnoticed by peers	S UNNPEE
Subject does not want to belong to current peer group	S NTWTPE
Peers have high regard for subject	P HRESU
Subject is an important member of peer group	S IMPPEE
Subject despises time spent with peer group	D TIMESP
Subject feels peers look down upon him/her	S LOOKD
Subject feels peers do not interest him/her	S NOTINT

Cutting Scores

The IPR has two clinical cutting scores. The first is a score of 30. Clients who score below 30, assuming accurate and candid responses, can be presumed to be free of a clinically significant problem in this area. Clients who score above 30 can be presumed to have a clinically significant problem in this area.

The second cutting score is 70. Clients who achieve scores this large or larger are nearly always experiencing severe distress. When distress reaches this level there is a clear possibility that some form of violence could be considered or used as a means of dealing with problems in this area. The therapist or counselor should not assume that violence is in the offing. However, it is a distinct possibility, and it should be investigated by the service provider (Hudson, 1982).

Validity

According to Balian (1994), a commonly used definition of validity is that it refers to the question: "Does the instrument accurately measure what it is supposed to measure?" Validity is a matter of the relevance of the items on the questionnaires to the variables being measured and their relationship to the desired outcome measure. It is apparent that for a test or questionnaire to be appropriate and worthy, it must be validated.

Balian (1994) identified three common forms of instrument validity: content, criterion-related, and construct. Content validity is a subjective form of validity evaluation. It consists of opinion and judgment as the method to derive valid test or survey items. Criterion-related validity is a method by which statistical measures, in the form of correlation coefficients, are established for the instruments. The two types of criterion-related validity are concurrent and predictive validity.

Reliability

According to Balian (1994), reliability evaluates the consistency of measurements. An instrument can be reliable but still not valid, yet every valid instrument must already be reliable. Some common reliability techniques include test-retest, split-half, and equivalent forms.

Test-retest reliability involves an instrument being administered twice to the same group of subjects with a short time lapse between testing. Theoretically, the subjects should each receive identified scores both times, if the test is consistent. A correlation coefficient is simply calculated to measure the amount of relationship between subjects' first and second answers (Balian, 1994).

The split-half reliability is an important variation of the test-retest procedure. Using split-half reliability involves first putting all test items in order of difficulty

or by subject matter groupings. Next, the test is split usually by odd and even question numbers. The theory states that if the total test is reliable, it should have highly related (correlated) scores between the two "versions," odd and even. This type of approach is a reasonable method of evaluating reliability, depending upon how equally the total test can be divided in terms of similarly (Balian, 1994).

In the equivalent forms method, two completely separate but equal tests are created. The subject group is tested twice, once with each equivalent test. A correlation coefficient calculated from both test scores on all subjects will indicate the reliability of the tests. The success of this method depends greatly on the true equivalency of the two test versions. This method requires two separate administrations of the instrument, which takes additional time and money (Balian, 1994).

Description of Subjects and Setting

The Child Treatment Center (CTC) School is located in a facility housing the Juvenile Court and Detention Center in southwest Atlanta, Georgia. The population of the city of Atlanta is 493,200. The CTC School is a program which is operated by the Atlanta Public Schools system. The certified and classified personnel of the CTC School are also employed by the Atlanta Public Schools system. The curriculum, books,

and materials utilized are commensurate with the Atlanta Public Schools system.

The CTC School serves approximately 114 male and female students whose ages range between 13 and 18 years. All of the students are housed in the Juvenile Detention Center. The teacher/pupil ratio is 1:17. Students are grouped for classes according to grade level. There is usually a substantial number of low academic functioning students, based on classroom performance, test data, and folder assessment. There is also a growing number of students who lack self-discipline or self-esteem.

The following data indicate the number of students incarcerated in the Fulton County Child Treatment Center and served by the Child Treatment Center School: 2,613 students were incarcerated (CTC), and 1,307 students were served (CTC School) from September 1, 1994, through March 31, 1995.

Protection of Subjects

Regarding the protection of human subjects, they were not identified by name in this study. Consent was upheld in addition to guidelines that were established by the CTC School.

Sampling Procedures

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between the dependent variable, adolescent violent behavior,

and the independent variables of illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment. For purposes of the study, African American male and female adolescents housed in the CTC School in Fulton County, Georgia, formed the group the research instruments were administered to. The ages of the adolescents ranged between 13 and 18. The population included all of the available juveniles in the CTC School program.

Administration Procedures

The following procedures were adhered to in conducting the study:

1. Permission to survey a group of adolescents enrolled in the CTC School was obtained from the principal of the CTC School.

2. Staff and assistants were trained in the administration procedures of the instruments.

3. During a single day, three instruments (the FES, the CPS, and the IPR) were administered to 61 adolescents who were enrolled at the CTC School.

4. Subjects were identified on each instrument by an assigned number, not by name.

5. The FES required 40 minutes, the CPS 15 minutes, and the IPR 20 minutes to complete.

6. Instruments were scored appropriately, and the data were subsequently analyzed.

Data Analysis

This study investigated the relationship between three selected variables and adolescent violent behavior. The data collected were used to test the hypotheses. The statistical tool which was used to analyze the data collected from the CTC School population was the Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation (Pearson *r*).

Correlational statistics were used because this study investigated the selected three variables and adolescent violent behavior. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to establish the relationship between each of the independent variables and the dependent variable. Each of the hypotheses was tested using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson *r*).

Limitations of the Study

Whenever a study is conducted, there are often some aspects over which the researcher cannot exert absolute control. These aspects represent limitations to the interpretation, use, and generalization of the findings. In this study, the following limitations are identified.

1. Only three variables are investigated. There are more which the study does not investigate.

2. The scope of the study was limited to adolescents.

3. Since surveys were administered to subjects, it is assumed that the responses given were accurate and honest.

4. This study was limited to a sample of residents within the juvenile justice system in Fulton County, Georgia.

5. Only 10 females were present in the CTC School on the day of the administration and participated in the study.

Summary

This chapter focused on the methodology as related to the current study. The subjects in this study were in a child treatment center program, in a facility housing the Juvenile Court and Juvenile Detention Center in southwest Atlanta, Georgia. The participants in the study were African-American males and females whose ages ranged between 13 and 18.

The instruments utilized in this study included the Family Environment Scale (FES), the Carlson Psychological Survey (CPS), and the Index of Peer Relations (IPR). This study was quantitative, and the method of data analysis was correlational.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between adolescent violent behavior and the variables of illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment. In this chapter the data derived from the administration of the Family Environment Scale (FES), the Carlson Psychological Survey (CPS), and the Index of Peer Relations (IPR) are analyzed and discussed. Faculty, staff, and students of the Child Treatment Center (CTC) School, a segment of the Fulton County Juvenile Justice System, were willing to participate in the study.

Instruments were collected from 61 subjects. Data collected from the questionnaires were subjected to descriptive and inferential statistical analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer programs. The independent and dependent variables were subjected to inferential statistics using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson *r*).

Data Analysis

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was selected for analysis of data. This technique measures the

strength of the linear relationship between two variables measured on an interval or ratio scale. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent that two sets of data gathered from the same sample were related: in this case, the dependent variable of adolescent violent behavior and each of three independent variables of illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment. The Pearson product-moment correlation is an appropriate tool for studying relationships among social and psychological variables. It is also appropriate because the subjects in this study do not represent a sample from a larger population (Elzey, 1985; Ott, Larson, Rexroat, & Mendenhall, 1992).

In the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, there is said to be a perfect correlation when the amount of increase in a score on one variable is exactly proportional to the amount of increase in the score on the corresponding variable, with no exceptions. However, a perfect correlation among two variables rarely occurs. In most cases, the relationship between two variable is less than perfect. The relationship is called positive when an increase in a score on one variable is associated with an increase in the score on the corresponding variable. There is a negative correlation when an increase in a score on one variable is

associated with a decrease in the score on the corresponding variable (Elzey, 1985; Ott et al., 1992). Research questions were answered in terms of the hypotheses offered.

Characteristics of the Sample

Table 4 presents an overview of the demographic characteristics of the subjects in the study. The sample consisted of 61 subjects, all of whom were African American; 51 (83%) were males and 10 (16%) were females.

The ages of the sample ranged from 13 to 18 at the time of the administration of the instruments, with the highest concentrations at ages 15 and 16. Grade levels in school were Grades 7 through 12, with the highest concentrations in Grades 10 and 11. All of the subjects were residents of Fulton County, Georgia.

Table 5 presents an overview of the marital status of the parents of the subjects. The majority of the subjects came from homes where parents were never married and were living apart. One or both of the parents of a few of the subjects were deceased.

Table 6 presents information regarding the number of siblings living in the household with the subject. The number of siblings ranged from zero to five.

Table 4

Demographic Characteristics

	Males		Females		
Characteristics	Number	%	Number	%	Total
Ethnicity:					
African American	51	83%	10	16%	61
Age:					
13	3	60%	2	40%	5
14	8	89%	1	11%	9
15	8	72%	3	27%	11
16	24	86%	4	14%	28
17	5	100%	0	0%	5
18	3	100%	0	0%	3
Grade:					
7	2	100%	0	0%	2
8	3	50%	3	50%	6
9	7	100%	0	0%	7
10	13	76%	4	24%	17
11	19	86%	3	14%	22
12	7	100%	0	0%	7
County of Residence:					
Fulton	51	83%	10	16%	61

Table 5

Marital Status of Parents of Subjects

Marital Status of Parents	Number of Subjects
Married	6
Separated	8
Divorced	10
Never married, living together	11
One parent deceased	7
Both parents deceased	4
Never married, living apart	15
Total	61

Table 6

Number of Subjects, with Number of Siblings in Household

Number of Siblings	Number of Subjects
0	5
1	11
2	22
3	13
4	8
5	2

Testing the Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that there is no significant relationship between adolescent violent behavior, and the variables of illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment.

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant relationship between illegal drug usage and adolescent violent behavior.

The .01 level of significance indicates that there is a significant relationship between illegal drug usage and adolescent violent behavior (see Table 7). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is rejected.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant relationship between peer association and adolescent violent behavior.

The .68 level of significance indicates no significant relationship between peer association and adolescent violent behavior (see Table 7). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 is accepted.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant relationship between family environment and adolescent violent behavior.

The .18 level of significance indicates no significant relationship between family environment and adolescent violent behavior (see Table 7). Therefore, Hypothesis 3 is accepted.

The findings from the analysis and information from the research questions are presented in Table 7. The findings did not in all instances reflect what was hypothesized.

Table 7

The Relationship Between Adolescent Violent Behavior and Family Environment, Illegal Drug Usage, and Peer Association

Variable	Correlation with Adolescent Violence	Significance
Family Environment	-.175	.18
Illegal Drug Usage	.618	.01*
Peer Association	.055	.68

*Significant beyond the .05 level.

Participants in this study, based on their responses, indicated that there is, in fact, a significant relationship between adolescent violent behavior and illegal drug usage (p = .01).

According to Otero-Lopez, Luengo-Martin, Muion-Redondo, Carrillo-De-La-Peña, and Romero-Trinañes (1994), empirical evidence (Dembo et al., 1991; Speckart & Anglin, 1985) supports the existence of a strong correlation between drug abuse and delinquency, regardless of drugs used, offenses committed, or the kind of population sampled.

The .18 level of significance indicates that there is no statistically significant relationship between adolescent violent behavior and family environment. The family environment is a significant context for adolescents. Nine studies which directly assessed distressed adolescents'

perceptions of their family environments revealed several consistent differences between distressed and nondistressed families of adolescents. The studies were conducted by Fox et al. (1983), Friedrich et al. (1982), Kirst-Ashman (1983), Kleinman et al. (1989), LeFlore (1988), Long and Jackson (1991), Moos and Moos (1986), Stern et al. (1989), and Wood et al. (1988).

The .68 level of significance indicates that there is no statistically significant relationship between adolescent violent behavior and peer association. In contrast to the findings of this study, Hagan (1991) and Warr (1993) reported that peer culture provides delinquent models to adolescents. Peer culture also provides a more tolerant environment for delinquency. Hirschi's (1969) control theory also contrasts with the findings of this particular study, in that he viewed peers as being regarded as potential instigators of delinquency.

Hypothesis 4. There is no greater occurrence of violent behavior among male adolescents than female adolescents.

This hypothesis was tested by examining data from the CPS, the FES, and the IPR. Results were examined for differences between responses of males and females.

Table 8 presents data from results of the CPS. This table compares the responses of males and females. One of the males in the study did not complete his instrument, as is reflected in the table.

Table 8

The Significance of the Carlson Psychological Survey, as It Relates to Males and Females

Variable	Gender	n	Mean	SE	t	df	p
Chemical abuse	Male	50	19.9	1.2	1.6	58	.111
	Female	10	15.3	2.1			
Thought disturbance	Male	50	23.6	0.93	-1.5	58	.131
	Female	10	27.5	3.0			
Antisocial tendencies	Male	50	41.7	1.8	0.064	58	.949
	Female	10	41.5	3.1			
Self-depreciation	Male	50	15.4	0.69	-1.1	58	.276
	Female	10	17.4	2.0			
Validity	Male	50	3.64	0.20	0.962	58	.340
	Female	10	3.2	0.13			

The CPS is comprised of the five variables of chemical abuse, thought disturbance, antisocial tendencies, self-depreciation, and validity, as shown. However, for the purposes of this study, the researcher was primarily interested in the chemical abuse and antisocial tendencies variables. The probability of .111 ($p < .05$) on the chemical abuse scale and .949 ($p < .05$) on the antisocial tendencies scale indicates no difference between the responses of males and females.

Table 9 presents data from the results of the FES. This table compares the responses of males and females. The FES is comprised of 10 subscales, as shown. In comparing the

Table 9

The Significance of the Family Environment Scale as It Relates to Males and Females

Variable	Gender	n	Mean	SE	t	df	p
Cohesion	Male	51	6.1	0.19	0.681	59	.495
	Female	10	5.7	0.76			
Expressiveness	Male	51	4.4	0.22	-0.466	59	.643
	Female	10	4.7	0.36			
Conflict	Male	51	3.5	0.24	-1.6	59	.098
	Female	10	4.6	0.27			
Independence	Male	51	5.1	0.23	0.303	59	.763
	Female	10	5.0	0.53			
Achievement Orientation	Male	51	5.6	0.25	-0.458	59	.649
	Female	10	5.9	0.37			
Intellectual-Cultural Orientation	Male	51	4.7	0.26	0.825	59	.413
	Female	10	4.2	0.61			
Active-Recreational Orientation	Male	51	5.3	0.23	-0.281	59	.078
	Female	10	5.5	0.89			
Moral-Religious Emphasis	Male	51	5.7	0.23	-1.8	59	.071
	Female	10	6.7	0.35			

(table continues)

Table 9 (Continued)

Variable	Gender	n	Mean	SE	t	df	p
Organization	Male	51	5.7	0.22	-1.7	59	.09
	Female	10	6.7	0.53			
Control	Male	51	4.9	0.24	-2.2	59	.003*
	Female	10	6.3	0.51			

*$p < .05$.

responses of males with females at the .05 level of significance, the control variable indicates a significant relationship (p = .03).

Table 10 presents data from the results of the IPR. This table compares the responses of males and females. The IPR is comprised of 25 variables which measure the relationship of peers. The items "subject feels understood by peers" (.04), "subject feels disliked by peers" (.01), and "subject feels peers look down upon him/her" (.02) indicate a level of significance, with $p < .05$. Two males improperly responded to items, which resulted in these two instruments being discarded.

Table 11 displays the identification of subjects by offender type. There are 18 nonoverlapping types which offenders fall into. The offender types on the CPS were designed as a method of validating the instrument by examining its ability to identify discrete, reliable, and meaningful types of offenders. Of the subjects who completed the CPS, 38 did not fit any of the 18 types. This does not mean that they were without problems.

Type 1. Drug and alcohol abuse is a major characteristic of this group. Some of these individuals exhibit little motivation toward bettering themselves. Others deny drug/alcohol problems. This type is generally seen as sociable and friendly, with few apparent hostile

Table 10

The Significance of the Index of Peer Relations as It Relates to Males and Females

Variable	Gender	n	Mean	SE	t	df	p
Self-awareness of peer relationships	Male	49	3.1	0.26	-0.729	57	.469
	Female	10	6.7	0.53			
Subject feels peers do not care about him/her	Male	49	2.8	0.28	-0.836	57	.407
	Female	10	3.4	0.52			
Subject feels mistreated by peers	Male	49	2.1	0.24	-1.015	57	.314
	Female	10	2.8	0.69			
Subject enjoys respect of peers	Male	49	2.6	0.25	-0.681	57	.499
	Female	10	3.1	0.73			
Subject feels as if he/she does not belong	Male	49	2.5	0.24	-0.630	57	.531
	Female	10	2.9	0.64			
Subject feels peers are snobs	Male	49	2.5	0.24	-0.847	57	.401
	Female	10	3.1	0.76			
Subject feels understood by peers	Male	49	2.5	0.25	-2.091	57	.041*
	Female	10	3.9	0.76			
Subject feels liked very much	Male	49	2.6	0.25	-0.782	57	.437
	Female	10	3.2	0.84			

(table continues)

Table 10 (Continued)

Variable	Gender	n	Mean	SE	t	df	p
Subject feels left out of peer groups	Male	49	2.2	0.24	0.007	57	.995
	Female	10	2.2	0.61			
Subject hates current peer group	Male	49	2.4	0.24	-1.770	57	.081
	Female	10	3.6	0.77			
Subject feels peers enjoy subject's company	Male	49	2.3	0.25	-1.176	57	.244
	Female	10	3.1	0.67			
Subject likes current peer group	Male	49	3.0	0.25	-0.724	57	.472
	Female	10	3.5	0.74			
Subject feels disliked by peers	Male	49	2.4	0.27	-2.540	57	.014*
	Female	10	4.3	0.85			
Subject desires a different peer group	Male	49	3.0	0.29	-0.079	57	.938
	Female	10	3.1	0.80			
Peers are nice to subject	Male	49	2.5	0.25	-0.728	57	.470
	Female	10	3.0	0.59			
Peers look up to subject	Male	49	3.4	0.26	-0.413	57	.681
	Female	10	3.7	0.65			
Subject thinks he/she is important	Male	49	3.4	0.29	0.378	57	.706
	Female	10	3.2	0.64			

(table continues)

Table 10 (Continued)

Variable	Gender	n	Mean	SE	t	df	p
Subject enjoys peers	Male	49	3.5	0.30	-0.515	57	.609
	Female	10	4.0	0.96			
Subject feels unnoticed by peers	Male	49	2.4	0.29	-0.994	57	.325
	Female	10	3.2	0.67			
Subject does not want to belong to current peer group	Male	49	2.9	0.33	-1.312	57	.195
	Female	10	4.0	0.84			
Peers have high regard for the subject	Male	49	3.1	0.31	0.906	57	.369
	Female	10	2.5	0.68			
Subject is an important member of peer group	Male	49	3.6	0.30	0.525	57	.602
	Female	10	3.3	0.68			
Subject despises time spent with peer group	Male	49	2.8	0.28	-1.247	57	.217
	Female	10	3.8	0.82			
Subject feels peers look down upon him/her	Male	49	2.3	0.24	-2.310	57	.025*
	Female	10	3.9	0.92			
Subject feels peers do not interest him/her	Male	49	3.4	0.32	0.282	57	.779
	Female	10	3.2	0.81			

*$p < .05$.

Table 11

Identification of Subjects by Offender Type

Offender Type	Subject No.	Frequency
1	58	1
2		0
3	12, 21, 37, 39, 50, 51, 55	7
4		0
5	1	1
6		0
7	38	1
8		0
9	22, 27	2
10		0
11	40	1
12		0
13	6, 20, 34, 36, 48, 54, 60	7
14	14	1
15		0
16		0
17	44	1
18		0
None	2, 3 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 2, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 52, 53, 56, 57, 59, 61	38

behaviors. However, many have a quick temper that may result in impulsive and destructive behavior. One subject fits this type.

Type 3. These individuals are usually described as immature and rebellious but not decidedly antisocial. They look to their peers for support and get into trouble while looking for this approval if they think some antisocial act will be looked upon with favor. Seven subjects fit this offense type.

Type 5. These individuals are markedly antisocial. These persons may on the surface appear as being charming and cooperative, but beneath exist characteristics of impulsivity, intolerance, hostility, aggression and irrational behaviors.

Type 7. These individuals reflect a disturbed personality, and psychiatric treatment is often recommended. They are immature and emotionally labile. This group desperately needs attention and emotional support and is very dependent on others, while at the same time they drive people away by being so irrational and demanding. Hypochondria is often found in this type. One subject is identified as offender Type 7.

Type 9. These individuals display elements of emotional instabilities, despite the fact that they come from stable and good home environments. These individuals are somewhat passive, shy, serious minded, and cooperative, yet they do

display some negative type behaviors. There may also be elements of dangerous or hostile behaviors existing.

Type 11. These individuals are generally described as emotionally passive but having favorable long-term prognosis; they may also be short tempered. They usually get in trouble as a result of their impulsiveness and their associations with undesirable persons. One subject is identified in this category.

Type 13. This offender type presents himself or herself as the victim of circumstances rather than as the offender. These individuals rationalize the offense and deny any guilt for it, with an excuse ready for each crime committed. Their judgment is faulty and so is their impulse control, making them easy targets for manipulative peers. The responses of seven subjects identify them as offender Type 13.

Type 14. Violent and aggressive behaviors are markedly characteristic of these individuals. When under stress they tend to go into panic reactions, which lead to aggressive behavior directed either toward themselves or others. There is a history of drug abuse which may have begun as a result of emotional problems in the past (one subject).

Type 17. Alcohol and drug abuse is predominant for this type. Even though some of these individuals became too dependent on their families, their home life was generally stable (one subject).

Thirty-eight subjects fell into the category of offender type identified as "none" by CPS. These subjects may have problems, but they are not consistent with the 18 nonoverlapping types.

The IPR utilizes cutting scores as described in Table 12. Thirty subjects scored below 30, 27 scored above 30, and 2 scored above 70. Whenever a score of 70 or larger is encountered on the IPR, the practitioner should be alerted to the possibility of violence. There is the distinct possibility that such high scoring clients may attempt violence against themselves or others (Hudson, 1997). Specifically for the IPR, the threat of violence is toward one or more members of the defined reference group (Hudson, 1997).

Table 12

A Description of the Cutting Scores on the IPR

Cutting Score	Description
First cutting score is 30.	Scoring below 30, individual is generally free of the problem being measured.
	Scoring above 30, clinically significant problem in the area being measured.
Second cutting score is 70.	Scoring 70 and above, individuals are nearly always experiencing severe distress. There is a possibility of violent behavior.

Source: Walmyr Assessment Scale Scoring Manual, 1997.

Table 13 identifies the scores on the IPR. Two cutting scores, 30 and 70, have been identified. The subjects were categorized according to the cutting score.

Subjects 38 and 45 scored 77 and 73, respectively, on the IPR. Both subjects were males. According to Hudson (1997), this scale was not designed to predict violence against others. The high scores of Subjects 38 and 45 represent a serious problem in the area being measured. Encountering these high scores did not allow the researcher to conclude that the subjects were involved in violent behavior.

An examination of the results of the three instruments with regard to males and females produced no significant difference between these two group adolescents. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Summary

This analysis is based on 61 cases. Data from three subjects were discarded due to the instruments being incomplete. The initial sample consisted of 10 females and 51 males.

For the purposes of this dissertation, it was hypothesized that there was no relationship between adolescent violent behavior and illegal drug usage. The data collected from subjects do not support this hypothesis.

Table 13

IPR: Identification of Scores by Subject

First cutting score = 30
Below 30, n = 30 (51%)
Scores ranged 4-29

Subject	Score	Subject	Score
30	4	61	18
60	4	23	19
29	5	53	19
47	6	56	19
51	6	16	23
20	7	22	23
27	7	1	25
50	7	14	25
28	8	55	25
42	9	35	26
7	11	5	27
37	14	25	28
57	16	43	28
33	17	2	29
19	18		
32	18		

First cutting score = 30
Above 30, n = 27 (46%)
Scores ranged 31-68

Subject	Score	Subject	Score
24	31	34	45
13	32	49	45
8	33	54	45
39	33	6	45
15	35	40	52
10	36	9	52
46	36	3	58
26	37	11	59
52	37	4	63
21	38	44	68
59	39	48	68
31	42		
36	42		
41	43		
58	43		
12	45		

(table continues)

Table 13 (Continued)

Second cutting score = 70 Above 70, n = 2 (3%) Range 73-77			
Subject	Score	Subject	Score
38	77	45	73

The second hypotheses was that there was no relationship between adolescent violent behavior and peer association. The data as reported by the subjects are in support of this hypothesis, which was accepted.

The third hypothesis of no relationship between adolescent violent behavior and family environment was supported by the data. The hypothesis was accepted.

The fourth hypothesis was that there was no greater occurrence of violent behavior among male adolescents than female adolescents. No significant relationship was found between males and females, and the hypothesis was accepted.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was embarked upon as an attempt to investigate the relationship between adolescent violent behavior and illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment. Literature related to the topic was examined. Questionnaires were administered to gather data on the extent of relations between adolescents and their families, their peers, and their involvement with illegal drugs. Through utilization of descriptive statistics, data were collected, analyzed, and presented. As a result of the data analysis, the relationship between the independent and the dependent variables was established.

Findings

The following findings surfaced as a result of the testing of the hypotheses of this study, utilizing the Pearson product-moment correlation techniques:

1. There is no statistically significant relationship between adolescent violent behavior and family environment.

2. There is a statistically significant relationship between adolescent violent behavior and illegal drug usage.

3. There is no statistically significant relationship between adolescent violent behavior and peer association.

4. There is no statistically significant relationship between adolescent violent behavior as it pertains to males and females.

Illegal drug usage, which is one of the variables in this study, is a widely known causal factor of adolescent violent behavior and is presented as having a significant relationship. The essence or nature of the type of drug varies from crack to heroin to PCP. Drugs are accessible to individuals at increasingly young ages. They can be bought on a street corner, or just as easily in a school yard or on a neighborhood playground. Drugs alter the body's chemistry and, therefore, affect the behavior of the user.

The findings of this study reflect that the participants did, in fact, utilize drugs at some time during their lives. Even though a small number of females participated in the study, both males and females responded positively to items regarding illegal drug usage.

The researcher assumes that the participants' environments provide readily available drugs and that they are probably a part of their everyday lives. These daily occurrences may include direct utilization, trafficking, or the possibility of observing the aftermath of drug overdoses. Another assumption of the researcher is that if

illegal drugs are a common occurrence, then the responses to the items on the CPS instrument are true.

Family environment, another variable, showed no relationship with adolescent behavior. The participants may have responded as if they had no direct ties, albeit strong relationships with family members. This type of relationship may exist in a single-parent home, in a two-parent home, or in a setting where participants were reared by siblings or other relatives but with little or no nurturing while growing up. The participants may simply not have been honest in their responses, in that this particular instrument (FES) consisted solely of true/false responses. The demographics gathered in this study did not include in-depth information about the subjects' families. Such information may have provided an insight into the responses.

Analysis of the data regarding the variable of peer association indicated no significant relationship with adolescent violent behavior. These findings are contrary to those reported in the literature. A possible reason for the findings in this study may be that adolescents felt a certain degree of loyalty to each other and were reluctant to provide responses which may reflect negatively on their peers. In some instances, the participants may not have been completely honest. Another factor to consider may be that of race. All subjects in this study were African Americans; in

the literature, however, the race of the subjects was not a consideration.

According to Warren (1976) and Hindelang (1971), sociological theories place all or most of the causal factors in the social environment (both cited in Toch, 1986). Some theories (psychological) place all or most criminogenic factors within the individual offender.

Miller (cited in Toch, 1986) argued that delinquency is disproportionately found among lower-class males because they subscribe to "focal concerns." The focal concerns are excitement, smartness, toughness, trouble, fate, and autonomy. Miller postulated that the lower-class culture places a value on courting trouble. Also, according to Miller, members of the lower class overtly value autonomy but often covertly seek out the security of institutions where autonomy is limited. Ultimately, they (lower-class males) believe that their fates are determined by forces beyond their control (external locus of control). Social class was not one of the variables of this study, but the researcher assumed that the subjects believed their fates are determined by external factors.

In regard to the findings, participants of this study were possibly not completely honest in their responses on all items. Other possible reasons for the findings include subjects not having a clear perception of the dynamics involved within a family environment or with peers,

instructions not being followed in the instruments, and subjects responding arbitrarily to items.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, recommendations are made to offer solutions to the problem of adolescent violent behavior.

1. Further studies should be done to investigate other variables, for example, family structure including birth order.

2. Society should have a more significant role in instilling values in young children. Positive influence should start in infancy and increase throughout young adulthood. Churches and schools should provide ongoing classes and activities in which family members are required to participate and learn about their roles in society.

3. The relationship between violent offenders and nonviolent offenders was not investigated for this study. These relationships can be investigated to determine the significance of the relationship.

4. The federal government should allot more funding for programs that will educate African-American adolescents about empowerment, leadership skills, and making positive decisions. Hopefully, such programs would deter them from participating in delinquent behavior.

5. Adolescents who are incarcerated should be mandated to attend classes to work toward a degree.

6. Adolescents in juvenile detention centers should receive a specific number of hours per day of schooling or tutoring while in detention.

Concerns in the Field of Counseling

Counselors work with students/clients who have numerous concerns. In working with adolescents, counselors focus on a wide range of problems. In the specific area of adolescent violent behavior, some concerns of counselors are as follows:

As related to the family environment, is this an abusive environment in which the adolescent is living? If so, what impact, if any, does it have on his/her behavior? Counselors should be concerned with the "role" of the counselor in working with adolescents who display violent behavior.

What type of intervention should be in place in making an attempt to work with these adolescents? The focus of this dissertation is on the variables of illegal drug usage, peer association, and family environment. Counselors should be concerned about other possible causal factors of adolescent violent behavior.

Counselors working in different settings, for example, school systems, should have access to resources outside of their current environment.

Counselors should be concerned as to whether or not there is a "quick fix" to adolescent violent behavior. If so, what is it?

How is society affected by adolescent violent behavior? How are family units affected by the violent behavior of one family member?

Implications for Further Research

The phenomenon of violent behavior has been researched for decades (Dembo et al., 1991; Gary, 1986; Inciardi, 1991). The results of this dissertation indicate the need for further research in the area of adolescent violent behavior. The targeted population for this project was adolescents in the Child Treatment Center, an affiliate of the Juvenile Justice System in Atlanta (Fulton County), Georgia. On the date the data were collected, 61 adolescents were present in school. Further research of adolescent violent behavior is needed for various reasons.

This sample size was relatively small, and for that reason a larger sample is needed to provide a wider range of information for the data analysis. The sample consisted of only 10 females. This number does not reflect upon incidents of violent crime in any specific area.

This study did not include socioeconomic factors as one of its variables. Information was not discussed regarding the financial means as to how adolescents or their families support themselves. Level of income was not mentioned whether or not crimes were committed as a means of supplementing current income. Another area for further research is academic success.

Participants in this study were currently enrolled in the Atlanta Public Schools system in Atlanta, Georgia. Data were collected pertaining to their current grade, but it was not known, for instance, whether or not any grades had been repeated. No information was given as to whether or not the subjects had dropped out of school and subsequently returned. Research was not included as to whether or not there is a relationship between dropping out of school and adolescent violent behavior.

Academic success can also pertain to grades or grading scales. Is there a relationship between grades and violent behavior? Do standardized test scores in some way influence violent behavior? In addition to academic success, further research can be implemented specifically pertaining to birth order of children in a family. Is the oldest sibling more inclined to become involved in violent behavior, as opposed to the youngest? What does research suggest about the relationship between only children and violent behavior? Yet

another factor to be considered for further study is family structure.

Even though data were gathered about the number of siblings and the marital status of heads of households, these relationships were not explored in extensive detail. Are violent adolescents more prone to have grown up in a single-parent environment, as opposed to having parental figures of both sexes? Does extended family environment have an impact on violent behavior?

This study investigated adolescents who are currently incarcerated. Further research could include a comparative study of incarcerated versus nonincarcerated adolescents. The study could include both males and females or be limited to only one gender.

Significance of Study

According to Wilson and Howell (1994), serious and violent juvenile crime has increased significantly over the past few years, straining America's juvenile justice system. With the increase in violent crimes, there was an increase in arrests, as well. The FBI (1993) reported that from 1988 to 1992 juvenile violent crime arrests increased 45%. Increases in juvenile arrests for specific offenses were murder (52%), rape (17%), robbery (49%), and aggravated assault (47%) (FBI, 1993).

Since many participants of violent behavior are adolescents and are attending school, school systems can be assisted in the development of programs to alleviate violent behavior. Partnerships can be established between schools and communities which enable students to interact with mentors. Findings of this study can also provide insights to adolescents and inform them of behaviors that are deviant and potentially unlawful.

As a result of this study, parents and professionals will increase their ability to identify factors as they relate to violent behavior. Additionally, these factors can be helpful in providing a clearer picture of the adolescent and how he or she is impacted by his environment. Overall, findings can prove useful to individuals who interact with and are affected by the actions of adolescents.

Summary

This chapter briefly summarized the study, and findings indicated by the testing of the hypotheses were presented. Recommendations were made based upon the findings of the study. Concerns in the field of counseling were discussed, as were implications for further research.

APPENDIX

Letter Requesting Permission
to Conduct the Survey

October 6, 1997

Dear Dr. Roseberry,

I am a graduate student in the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services at Clark Atlanta University. I am in the process of completing my dissertation, the focus of which is adolescent violent behavior. I am requesting your permission to administer three instruments to the students enrolled in the Child Treatment Center School.

If additional information is needed, I can be reached at 404-215-7709. Your assistance in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gwendolyn D. Jones

Letter Granting Permission
to Conduct the Survey

ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Child Treatment Center School
445 Capitol Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30312

Carrie L. Roseberry, Ed.D.
Instructional Administrator
(404) 730-1085

October 22, 1997

Dear Ms. Jones:

This letter is a follow-up of your request to administer three instruments to students who are currently enrolled in the Child Treatment Center program. I welcome your interest in our program and will make every effort to accommodate your needs for the research project you are conducting.

Please call me at (404) 730-1086, so we can discuss the details involved in this activity.

Sincerely,

Carrie Roseberry

Carrie Roseberry, Ed.D.

CR/gst

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, J. (1994, January). Kids growing up scared. Newsweek, 10, 44-49.

Allen-Hagen, B., & Sickmund, M. (1993, July). Juveniles and violence: Juvenile offending and victimization (Fact Sheet No. 3). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

American Psychological Association. (1993). Violence and youth. Washington, DC: Author.

Arnold, R. (1990). Processes of victimization and criminalization of black women. Social Justice, 17, 153-166.

Balian, E. (1994). The graduate research guidebook: A practical approach to doctoral/masters research. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Baskin, R., & Sommers, I. (1993). Females' initiation into violent street crime. Justice Quarterly, 10(4), 559-581.

Bell, L., & Bell, D. (1982). Family climate and the role of the female adolescent: Determinants of adolescent functioning. Family Relations, 31, 519-527.

Benjamin, R., & Benjamin, M. (1981). Sociocultural correlates of Black drinking: Implications for research and treatment. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 42(9), 241-245.

Bischof, G., Stitch, S., & Wilson, S. (1992). A comparison of the family systems of adolescent sexual offenders and nonsexual offending delinquents. Family Relations, 41, 318-323.

Break the cycle of despair. (1994, March 6). The Atlanta Journal-The Atlanta Constitution, p. 7F.

Bryant, P. (1994, March 6). Break the cycle of despair. Atlanta Journal-Constitution, p. 7F.

Carlson, K. (1982). Carlson Psychological Survey manual. Port Huron, MI: Sigma Assessment Systems, Inc.

Children's Defense Fund. (1995). The state of America's children: Yearbook 1995. Washington, DC: Author.

Claes, M., & Simard, R. (1992). Friendship characteristics of delinquent adolescents. International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 3, 287-301.

Clark, R. (1983). Family life and school achievement. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clement, F., & Kleiman, M. B. (1977). Fear of crime in the U.S.: A multivariate analysis. Social Forces, 56, 519-531.

Cloward, R., & Ohlin, L. (1960). Delinquency and opportunity. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, A. K. (1955). Delinquent boys. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, A. K., et al. (1956). The Sutherland papers. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Coleman, J. (1961). The adolescent society. New York: Free Press.

Collins, J. J. (1988). Suggested explanatory frameworks to clarify the alcohol use/violence relationship. Contemporary Drug Problems, 15(1), 107-121.

Conger, J., & Petersen, A. (1984). Adolescence and youth. New York: Harper & Row.

deBrun, S. R. (1981, Winter). The psycho-social dimensions of preadolescence. Adolescence, 16, 913-918.

Dembo, R., Williams, L., Getreu, A., Genung, L., Schmeidler, J., Berry, E., Wish, E. D., & LaVoile, L. (1991). A longitudinal study of the relationships among marijuana/hashish use, cocaine use and delinquency in a cohort of high risk youths. Journal of Drug Issues, 21, 271-312.

Dix, T. (1991). The affective organization of parenting: Adaptive and maladaptive processes. Psychological Bulletin, 110, 3-25.

Elliott, D. S., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S. S. (1985). Explaining delinquency and drug use. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Elzey, F. F. (1985). Introductory statistics: A microcomputer approach. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Erikson, E. (1959). Identity and the life cycle. New York: International Universities Press.

Fagan, J., & Chin, Ko-lin. (1991). Journal of Drug Issues, 21(2), 313-343.

Fagan, J., Wies, J., & Cheng, Y. (1990). Delinquency and substance use among inner-city students. Journal of Drug Issues, 20(3), 351-402.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1991). Uniform crime reports: 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1993). Uniform crime reports: 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Fitzgerald, J. (1997). Malcolm X's grandson depicted as having a troubled life (electronic data). Philadelphia Online--The Philadelphia Inquirer, National.

Fox, R., Rotatori, A., Macklin, F., Green, H., & Fox, T. (1983). Socially maladjusted adolescents' perceptions of their families. Psychological Reports, 52, 831-834.

Fraser, M. W. (1995). Violence. In R. L. Edwards (Ed.), Encyclopedia of social work, Vol. 2 (19th ed.) (pp. 2453-2460). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Fraser, M. W. (1996, July). Aggressive behavior in childhood and early adolescence: An ecological-developmental perspective on youth violence. Social Work, 41(4).

Friedrich, W., Reims, R., & Jacobs, J. (1982). Depression and suicidal ideation in early adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11(5), 403-407.

Garfinkle, A. S. (1982). Genetic and environmental influences on the development of Piagetian logico-mathematical concepts and other specific cognitive abilities: A twin study. Acta Genetical Medicae Gemellologiae, 31, 10-61.

Gary, L. (1986). Drinking, homicide, and the Black male. Journal of Black Studies, 17(1), 15-31.

Glick, R., & Neto, V. (1977). National study of women's correctional programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Goverment Printing Office.

Golinko, B. E. (1984, Fall). Adolescence: Common pathways through life. Adolescence, 19, 749-751.

Gove, W. R., & Crutchfield, R. D. (1982). The family and delinquency. Sociological Quarterly, 23, 301-319.

Hansen, J. (1994, April 3). What to do about violent kids. Atlanta Journal-Constitution, p. 7F.

Hayes, W. (1993, July). Assaults on the rise in nation's schools. Black Issues in Higher Education, 18-20.

Hindelang, M. (1971, Spring). Age, sex, and versatility of delinquent involvements. Social Problems, 18, 522-535.

Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of delinquency. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Hudson, W. (1982). The clinical measurement package: A field manual. Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Huling, T. (1991). New York groups call on state lawmakers to release women in prison (press release). Albany, NY: Correctional Association of New York.

Inciardi, J. A. (1969). Causes of delinquency and the family. Youth and Society, 9, 299-313.

Inciardi, J. A. (1980). Youth, drugs and street crime. In F. R. Scarpitti & S. K. Datesman (Eds.), Drugs in the youth culture (pp. 175-204). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Inciardi, J. A., & Pottieger, J. (1991). Kids, crack, and crime. Journal of Drug Issues, 21(2), 257-270.

Jennings, P. (1993). Kids in the crossfire: Violence in America. New York: ABC News, MPI Home Video.

Jensen, G. (1972). Parents, peers, and delinquent action: A test of the differential association perspective. American Journal of Sociology, 78, 562-575.

Jensen, G., & Brownfield, D. (1983). Parents and drugs: Specifying the consequences of attachment. Criminology, 21, 543-554.

Jensen, G., & Rojek, D. (1980). Delinquency: A sociological view. D. C. Heath.

Johnson, S. D., Gibson, L., & Linden, R. (1978). Alcohol and rape in Winnipeg, 1966-1975. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 39, 1887-1894.

Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P., & Eveland, L. (1978). Drugs and delinquency: A search for causal connections. In D. B. Kandel (Ed.), Longitudinal research on drug use: Empirical findings and methodological issues. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.

Joseph, J. (1995, March). Journal of Black Studies, 25(4), 475-491.

Kandel, D. (1978). Drugs and delinquency: A search for causal connections. In D. B. Kandel (Ed.), Longitudinal research on drug use: Empirical findings and methodological issues. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.

Kandel, D., Simcha-Fagan, O., & Davies, M. (1986). Risk factors for delinquency and illicit drug use from adolescence to young adulthood. Journal of Drug Issues, 16(1), 68-90.

Kelly, D. (1980). Criminal behavior: Readings in criminology. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kirst-Ashman, K. (1983). Exploration of the family environment and problems of uncontrollable adolescents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.

Kleinman, S., Handal, P., Enos, D., Searight, H., & Ross, M. (1989). Relationship between perceived family climate and adolescent adjustment. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 18(4), 351-359.

Krauss, C. (1994, November 13). The nation: No crystal ball needed on crime. New York Times (late ed.: Final, Sec. 4), p. 4.

LeBlanc, M. (1993). Prevention of adolescent delinquency: An integrative, multilayered, theoretically based perspective. In D. P. Farrington, R. Sampson, & P. O. Wilkstrom (Eds.), Linking community and individual levels: Explanations of crime. Stockholm: National Council on Crime Prevention.

LeFlore, L. (1988). Delinquent youths and family. Adolescence, 23, 629-642.

Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1987). Prediction. In H. Quay (Ed.), Handbook of juvenile delinquency (pp. 15-33). New York: Wiley.

Long, P., & Jackson, J. (1991). Children sexually abused by multiple perpetrators. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6(2), 147-159.

Marcus, R. (1996). The friendships of delinquents. Adolescence, 31(121), 145-158.

Matlack, M. F., McGreevy, M. S., Rouse, R., Flatter, C., & Marcus, R. (1994). Family correlates of social skill deficits in incarcerated and nonincarcerated adolescents. Adolescence, 29(113), 117-132.

Matter, R. M. (1984, Spring). The historical emergence of adolescence: Perspectives from developmental psychology and adolescent literature. Adolescence, 19, 131-142.

Matya, D., & Sykes, G. (1961). Juvenile delinquency and subterranean values. American Sociological Review, 26, 712-719.

McBride, D. C. (1981). Drugs and violence. In J. A. Inciardi (Ed.), The drugs-crime connection. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

McKeithan, G., Assistant District Attorney of Fulton County, GA. (1994, April 6). Interview by author; tape recording. Atlanta, GA.

Merton, R. (1938). Social structure and anomie. American Sociological Review, 3, 712-719.

Miller, E. (1986). Street woman. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Miller, W. (1958). Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. Journal of Social Issues, 14, 5-19.

Moone, J. (1994, June). Juvenile victimization: 1987-1992 (Fact Sheet No. 17). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Moos, R. H. (1975). Evaluating correctional and community settings. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Moos, R. H. (1994). The Social Climate Scales: A user's guide. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. (1981). Family environment scale manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. (1986). Family environment scale manual (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Moss, S. (1986). Women in prison: A case of pervasive neglect. Women and Therapy, 5, 5-10.

Murdoch, D., Phil, R. W., & Ross, D. (1990). Alcohol and crimes of violence: Present issues. International Journal of the Addictions, 25(9), 1065-1081.

National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law and the National Crime Prevention Council. (1986). Violent crime. In Teens, crime, and the community: Education and action for safer schools and neighborhoods (pp. 46-61). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Numbers speak loudest. (1994, April). The Atlanta Journal-The Atlanta Constitution (editorial page).

Ornstein, A. C. (1992). Secondary and middle school teaching methods. New York: Harper-Collins. (Adapted from E. H. Erikson, Childhood and society. New York: Norton, 1950, pp. 47-74.)

Otero-Lopez, J. M., Luengo-Martin, A., Muion-Redondo, L., Carrillo-De-La-Peña, M. T., & Romero-Trinañes, E. (1994). An empirical study of the relations between drug abuse and delinquency among adolescents. British Journal of Criminology, 34(4), 459-478.

Ott, R. L., Larson, R., Rexroat, C., & Mendenhall, W. (1992). Statistics: A tool for the social sciences, 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Duxbury Press.

Phares, E. J. (1972). A social learning theory approach to psychopathology. In J. Rotter, J. Chana, & E. J. Phares (Eds.), Applications of a social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Pollack-Byrne, J. (1990). Women, prison, and crime. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Poole, E., & Regoli, R. (1979). Parental support, delinquent friends, and delinquency: A test of interaction effects. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 70, 188-193.

Prothrow-Stith, D. B. (1995). The epidemic of youth violence in America: Using public health prevention strategies to prevent violence. Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 6(2), 95-101.

Reckless, W. (1961). A new theory of delinquency and crime. Federal Probation, 25, 42-46.

Reno, J. (1995). Juvenile offenders and victims: A national report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Robertson, D., & Hyde, J. (1982). The factorial validity of the Family Environment Scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 42, 1233-1241.

Roman, L. (1990, March/April). Jailed mothers risk losing their kids. New Directions for Women, p. 12.

Rosenburg, M. L. (1995). Violence in America: An integrated approach to understanding and prevention. Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 6(2), 102-112.

Silk, M., & McDonald, R. R. (1994, April 10). Bad kids: Polls and politicians say get tough, but it may not be that simple. Atlanta Journal-Constitution, p. 1F.

Simons, R., Whitbeck, L. B., Conger, R. L., & Conger, K. J. (1991). Parenting factors, social skills, and value commitments as precursors to school failure, involvement with deviant peers, and delinquent behavior. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 20(6), 645-664.

Slater, E., & Haber, J. (1984, October). Adolescent adjustment following divorce as a function of family conflict. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 920-921.

Snyder, H. (1994). Are juveniles driving the violence trends? (Fact sheet). Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (1995, May). Juvenile offenders and victims: A focus on violence (Publication No. NCJ 153570). Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Sorry about slaying, teen says in taped confession. (1995, February 28). Atlanta Journal-Constitution, p. 6B.

Speckart, G., & Anglin, M. D. (1985). Narcotics use and crime: An analysis of existing evidence for a causal relationship. Behavioral Science and the Law, 3, 259-283.

Stern, S., Dixon, K., Jones, D., Lake, M., Nemzar, E., & Sansone, R. (1989). Family environment in anorexia nervosa and bulimia. International Journal of Eating Disorders, 8(1), 25-31.

Sutherland, E. (1939). The principles of criminology. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Sutherland, E. (1947). Principles of criminology (4th ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Sutherland, E., & Cressey, D. (1974). Criminology. New York: J. B. Lippincott.

Tappan, R. W. (1947). Who is the criminal? American Sociological Review, 12, 100-110.

Teen attacked, severely beaten. (1995, March 15). Atlanta Journal-Constitution, p. 7B.

Teen's slaying in Clayton may be gang-related. (1995, March 24). Atlanta Journal-Constitution, p. 4B.

Thornberry, T. P. (Ed.). (1997). Advances in criminological theory, Vol. 7: Developmental theories of crime and delinquency. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

A tide of drug killing. (1989, January 16). Newsweek, pp. 44-45.

Toch, H. (1986). Psychology of crime and criminal justice. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Tolan, P. H. (1988). Delinquent behaviors and male adolescent development: A preliminary study. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 17(5), 413-427.

Tuckman, B. S. (1994). Conducting educational research (4th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

U.S. Department of Justice. (1990). Sourcebook of justice statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice. (1992). Crime in the United States 1991: Uniform crime reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Veneziano, C., & Veneziano, L. (1988). Knowledge of social skills among institutionalized juvenile delinquents: An assessment. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15(2), 152-171.

The Walmyr Assessment Scale scoring manual. (1997). Tallahassee, FL: Walmyr Publishing Co.

Warr, M. (1993). Parents, peers, and delinquency. Social Forces, 72, 247-264.

Warren, M. (1976). Intervention with juvenile delinquents. In M. Rosenheim (Ed.), Pursuing justice for the child. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weis, K., & Milankovich, M. (1975). Politics and measure of success in the war on crime. Crime and Delinquency, 21, 1-10.

Weisheit, R., & Mahan, S. (1988). Women, crime, and criminal justice. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Wilson, J. Q., & Herrnstein, R. J. (1985). Crime and human nature. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Wilson, J., & Howell, J. (1994). Serious and violent juvenile crime: A comprehensive strategy. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 45(2), 3-14.

Windle, M. (1992). A longitudinal study of stress buffering for adolescent problem behaviors. Developmental Psychology, 28(3), 522-530.

Wolfgang, M. E., & Ferracute, F. (1967). The subculture of violence. London: Tavistock.

Wood, J., Chapin, K., & Hannah, E. (1988). Family environment and its relationship to underachievement. Adolescence, 23(90), 283-290.